

together with the estimate, be referred to the Committee on Printing of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES L. FAUST

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. FAUST, a Representative from the State of Missouri.

*Resolved*, That a committee of 19 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

*Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect, this House do now adjourn.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], who had to leave to catch a train, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk and ask for their adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolutions. The resolutions (S. Res. 281) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. FAUST, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

*Resolved*, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed as the committee on the part of the Senate, under the second resolution, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

#### AJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 20, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 19 (legislative day of December 17), 1928*

#### MEMBER UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Sherman J. Lowell.

#### DIRECTOR OF THE MINT

Robert J. Grant.

#### POSTMASTERS

##### CALIFORNIA

Jay K. Battin, Angwin.  
Jeremiah R. Brown, Arcata.  
Joseph C. Beard, Burlingame.  
Nella Carl, Encanto.  
Wallace B. Sawyer, Galt.  
Felix B. LaCrosse, Half Moon Bay.  
Josephine C. McCabe, Imola.  
John E. Nolan, Jamestown.  
Frank B. Clark, Mount Lowe.  
Carolyn M. Orcutt, Niles.  
Ora Lester Dunn, Quincy.  
Charles J. Funk, Redondo Beach.  
William J. Martin, Salinas.  
Grace E. Patterson, Samoa.

##### INDIANA

William M. Willmore, Vincennes.

##### LOUISIANA

Blanche V. Williams, Angola.  
Charles E. Hearne, Chatham.  
Katherine J. Moynagh, Harvey.  
Johnnie D. Stag, Longville.  
Eunice O. Randolph, Meridian.  
Albert A. Thoman, Monroe.  
Rena F. Eckart, Natalbany.  
Sam H. Campbell, Oak Grove.  
Henry D. Wilson, Ruston.  
Lillie Vaughan, Sellers.  
Roland R. Sibille, Sunset.  
Thomas C. Reagan, sr., Winnsboro.

##### MONTANA

Rollin T. Spaulding, Stevensville.

##### PENNSYLVANIA

Sara A. Conrath, Dixonville.  
William W. Weise, Donora.  
John A. McKeage, Mahaffey.  
Donald A. Whoolery, Smithfield.  
Bessie Havlichek, Smock.  
Mearl W. Smith, Wehrum.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, December 19, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We are sincerely grateful to Thee, our God and our Father, that it is sublimely true that all things are possible to him that believeth. Increase the power of our faith in Thee—the faith that is the evidence of the unseen and the substance of our hopes for time and for eternity. Failure to trust leads us to be distrusted, and how helpless and weak we become. Let our belief in the final triumph of all things good be so strong in us that it can not be shattered. Thou hast no wonderful secrets for the unbeliever; Thou dost keep and unfold them even to Thy humble children. Lead us with strong wills and soul might to believe that we are part of a great plan and are servants of a great purpose that shall carry with them the rapture of moral victory, spiritual progress, the aspirations and the onward march of our country. Through Christ, our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4302) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey the Federal Point Lighthouse Reservation, N. C., to the city of Wilmington, N. C., as a memorial to commemorate the Battle of Fort Fisher."

The message also announced that the Senate had concurred in the following resolution:

#### House Concurrent Resolution 45

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, December 22, 1928, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Thursday, January 3, 1929.

#### PAVING OF DRY VALLEY ROAD, STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3881) to provide for the paving of the Government road, known as the Dry Valley Road, commencing where said road leaves the La Fayette Road, in the city of Rossville, Ga., and extending to Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, constituting an approach road to said park, with House amendments, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a bill that was passed the other day on the unanimous consent calendar after an agreement had been reached, which was accepted by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TAYLOR] who had charge of the bill in the House. Now, there is no use of some of us working on the Consent Calendar bills if they are going back to the Senate and a conference is to be ordered, which means, in nearly every case, that they will be restored to their original terms; and by reason of the fact that I feel an agreement reached on consent day should be an agreement

that would bind at least those in charge of the bill in the House, I am obliged to object to this bill going to conference.

Mr. MORIN. I think the purpose of the conference is that we insist on the House amendments.

Mr. CRAMTON. If I can have assurance that the conferees will insist on the House amendments, then I have no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that is the purpose of asking for the conference and have been requested to do this by the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. JAMES.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is on his feet, and I would be interested to hear from him as to what will happen if this goes to conference.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the bill in question is a bill which was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Georgia, Mr. HARRIS. The agreement which was made by myself the other day was entered into with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] in the utmost good faith, and I am in no way responsible for the action of the Senate.

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand that, of course, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TARVER. Or the action of the Senator in asking that conferees be appointed.

At the time the bill was under consideration I urged the inadvisability of the adoption of the amendment. I believe the bill in its original form is just and fair and should have been enacted, but somewhat under compulsion I was forced to make the agreement with the gentleman from Michigan. I have in no way been active in seeking to bring about a disagreement with the House amendments or a conference. Of course, since it has been determined by the Senate that a conference is advisable, it seems to me that one should be had, and so far as I am concerned in my future vote in the premises I shall be inclined to adopt as my attitude whatever the attitude of the conference committee may be; but, certainly, Senator HARRIS, not being a party to this agreement and being the author of the bill, had the right to move to disagree to the House amendments.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman from Georgia is absolutely correct as to that and with the assurance of the gentleman from Pennsylvania who will probably be the head of the House conference—

Mr. MORIN. No; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES] will be the chairman of the conference.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman assures us the conferees will maintain the House position, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JAMES, WAINWRIGHT, and McSWAIN.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, before we leave this question, it looks to me as if the record is left in a rather unfortunate situation if we are going to have a real conference. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has bound the tentative chairman of the House conferees to the proposition of maintaining the House attitude and that practically amounts to no conference.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is the kind of conference I feel the House should have in this case.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If that is the state the record is to be left in, I think it ought to be made perfectly clear. That is all I have to say about it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CRAMTON. My understanding of the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORIN], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, is an assurance that no report will come back to the House increasing the appropriation as passed by the House.

#### COMMITTEE RESIGNATIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

DECEMBER 19, 1928.

Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,

*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Committees on Census; Education; Coinage, Weights, and Measures; and War Claims.

Sincerely yours,

FLORENCE P. KAHN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Also the following:

DECEMBER 18, 1928.

The SPEAKER,

*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation, to become effective immediately, of my membership upon the following commit-

tees of the House of Representatives: Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Mines and Mining, Revision of the Laws, Territories.

Sincerely yours,

J. RUSSELL LEECH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, accepted.  
There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Also the following:

DECEMBER 18, 1928.

Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,

*Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: I hereby resign from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Respectfully,

WM. M. MORGAN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, accepted.  
There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Also the following:

DECEMBER 19, 1928.

Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,

*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign as chairman of Elections Committee No. 1.

Because of other changes in committee assignments, I ask that this resignation be effective at once.

Sincerely yours,

DON B. COLTON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, accepted.  
There was no objection.

Also the following:

DECEMBER 15, 1928.

Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,

*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Due to the many demands made on me in order to clear up matters affecting my district before I retire on March 4, I find it will be impossible for me to attend to my duties as a member of the Committee on Roads, and therefore tender you my resignation as a member of that committee. I am doing this because, appreciating the importance of the committee, I feel some one should be appointed in my place at the earliest possible moment.

For the past 20 years I have been deeply interested in the improvement of roads and my work on the committee has been very pleasant. I shall never forget the courtesies extended to me by my colleagues who are members of the committee, and especially the chairman.

With best wishes, I am

Yours very sincerely,

W. J. SEARS, M. C.

The resignation was accepted.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk and ask immediate consideration of the following resolution:

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 270

*Resolved*, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected chairmen and members of the following-named standing committees of the House, to wit:

CARROLL L. BEEDY, of Maine, chairman of the Committee on Elections No. 1.

DON B. COLTON, of Utah, chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, JAMES WOLFENDEN, of Pennsylvania, Committee on Banking and Currency.

FRANCIS D. CULKIN, of New York, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

W. M. MORGAN, of Ohio, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

FLORENCE P. KAHN, of California, Committee on Military Affairs.

J. RUSSELL LEECH, Pennsylvania, Committee on Naval Affairs.

EARL W. VINCENT, Iowa, Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts, Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

ROBERT R. BUTLER, Oregon, Committee on the Public Lands and Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, JUDICIARY, AND THE DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR

Mr. SHREVE, from the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, reported the bill H. R. 15569, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, which was ordered printed and referred to the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama reserved all points of order.



## WILLIAM TYLER PAGE

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is always a great pleasure to make reference to long and faithful service, in any worthwhile fields of endeavor, and when it occurs in connection with an official of this House it is especially gratifying. I rise now to call attention to the fact that 47 years ago to-day, William Tyler Page, the very efficient Clerk of this House, entered upon his duties as an employee of the House of Representatives and has been in continuous service during the entire 47 years. [Applause.] In order that you may not think of our very genial Clerk as having as yet grown old in this honorable service, I mention the fact that he was only 13 years of age when he began his service.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. And it is the fact that our good friend, Hon. William Tyler Page has the high regard, respect, and warm friendship not only of all Members regardless of their political affiliations but also of every person who with him here has served the Government.

Mr. TILSON. The question of party affiliation has nothing whatever to do with the high regard in which the membership of this House hold Tyler Page. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

## PROSPERITY ADDRESSES AND MESSAGES OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last, our good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT], who, I am sorry to say, is out of the Hall at this moment, made a speech on this floor. With a portion of the gentleman's speech I agree. With some of it I find myself in disagreement. Some of it, I am sorry to say, I can not regard as in full accord with all the facts in the case. I refer for the present to one paragraph of the gentleman's speech only. As he is not present, and, in order to be sure that I do not misrepresent him, I shall read it:

For eight years I have heard Presidents' messages of prosperity, of dollars and cents, until materialism has become nauseating. Not once has ever been mentioned education, refinement, the arts, the sciences, honesty, morality, patriotism, or Christianity. Think of the President confining an entire address on George Washington to his farms, his slaves, his business ability, and material prosperity!

This paragraph from the gentleman's speech covers a period of eight years and reflects upon two Presidents. Of course, we are all familiar with the messages of these Presidents during the eight years, and we know that in many instances in the messages and other public utterances of both these Presidents references direct and inferential were made in numerous instances to the subjects which the gentleman from Kentucky says have never been mentioned. All that Members have to do to verify what I say is to secure copies of the several messages and other public utterances of these Presidents and read for themselves.

For the present I shall quote from only one public address of our present President, and I refer to it because it is printed in the same issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that carries the speech of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

On pages 771 and 772 of the RECORD appears the gentleman's speech. Beginning on page 745, there is extended by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] an address by President Coolidge delivered at the dedication of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battle Fields Memorial on Friday, October 19, 1928. I shall read only two extracts from this speech which bear directly on the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I do not see the gentleman from Kentucky present at the moment, but my recollection of his statement is that he referred to messages of the President to Congress, and not addresses made on outside occasions, and if my construction of his language is correct, I do not think it is an impeachment of his statement to read from a speech made by the President outside of a message to Congress.

Mr. TILSON. I am not offering these particular excerpts to contradict the gentleman from Kentucky, who is a most

estimable, admirable, and truthful gentleman. Every Member of the House is fond of the gentleman from Kentucky and respects him for his fine work in the House, but even a good Member may sometimes get his facts twisted and give a very erroneous impression. I wish at this time to put into the RECORD only two brief extracts from a public utterance of President Coolidge, which give a directly contrary view to that which the gentleman from Kentucky has represented as the presidential attitude toward certain subjects of very great moment.

Mr. BLANTON rose.

Mr. TILSON. I am not willing to yield to the gentleman from Texas until I read the excerpt from an address of President Coolidge which I wish to get in here at this point. In the address of President Coolidge at Fredericksburg, after having referred to material prosperity, giving facts and figures, he goes on to say:

These figures, which would be cold and uninteresting in themselves, when we realize that they illustrate the life and development of our country, can not fail to have a deep fascination. But those wonderful records would be of little avail if they were not accompanied by evidences of the moral power of the Nation. Education is on the increase. Our charities are lavish and world-wide. Our missionary efforts reach in every direction. Our actions in behalf of limitation of naval armaments have been of great benefit to all mankind.

There is just one more extract that I wish to put into the RECORD from the same speech:

Such are some of the outlines of the mansion in which dwell the people of the United States. It is "a house not made with hands." Into it have gone the sacrifices and prayers of many generations. While it is by no means complete, it is already the most comfortable habitation which a nation ever enjoyed. Its prevailing atmosphere is marked by progress, peace, and tranquillity. Sectional animosities have disappeared. Industrial conflicts have almost ceased. Her territorial integrity is secure. Her constitutional liberties are protected by the eternal vigilance of her people. Our country is still worthy of those who have made such great sacrifices in its behalf, still determined to improve the opportunities which those sacrifices created, still loyal to the faith of the past, still inspired by the hope of the future.

These two extracts from a very recent speech of the President should be set in juxtaposition to the speech of the gentleman from Kentucky, a considerable part of which might well be characterized as the "Reflections of Gloomy Gus the morning after."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended for a quarter of a minute in order that I may ask him a question.

Mr. TILSON. I do not desire any extension of time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman should have quoted from some of the President's messages to the Congress.

## FORMER REPRESENTATIVE W. A. CALDERHEAD

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, with sorrow I rise to announce the death of Hon. W. A. Calderhead, who passed from this life on yesterday, December 18, at Enid, Okla.

For 14 years Mr. Calderhead represented in this body the district that I now have the honor to serve, and during all those years he rendered faithful and efficient service to the great benefit of my district the State of Kansas, and our common country. I think perhaps his greatest effort was in the defense and maintenance of the gold standard on which our monetary system is now based, and I know that the old Members of the House will learn of his passing with sorrow.

Mr. Calderhead will be buried at his home in Marysville, in Marshall County, Kans., where I knew him since 1891. He was a clean, honorable, and able man, whom I was always glad to have for a friend.

## ADDRESS OF THE SECRETARY OF WAR AT KILL DEVIL HILLS, N. C.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein an address delivered by the Secretary of War at Kitty Hawk, N. C.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address of the Secretary of War at Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, N. C., December 17, 1928:

Since time immemorial nations have consecrated battle fields and erected monuments to their distinguished sons. This Nation, dedicated to peace, may well consecrate these sea-swept, sandy shores as a peace-

time battle field, for here mankind won a notable battle; here man conquered air. Here, where they won their first great victory, will be erected a monument to our peace-time pioneers of progress, Wilbur and Orville Wright.

Since their first flight in 1903 aviation has made tremendous progress. The great continent that lies to the west of us is being covered with an invisible network of airways. This mighty ocean has been dwarfed by brave men and women who, in their tiny planes, defied space and sea.

The memorial soon to arise here will forever keep alive the names of these two Americans who gave wings to the world; but an even greater memorial to Wilbur and Orville Wright will be the part to be played by the future expansion of aviation in fostering peace, prosperity, and progress throughout the world.

Even as we to-day lay the cornerstone of this memorial, so aviation of to-day is building the foundation for a great structure—the aviation of to-morrow. From that foundation time can never erase the names of those two brothers who had the courage, the ability, and patience to transform man's dream of flight into the realm of reality—Wilbur and Orville Wright.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] for 40 minutes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I asked for the indulgence of the House this morning in contemplation of a hearing that we were having the day before yesterday morning before the joint committee of the two Houses, known as the Tax Committee, composed of five members of the Finance Committee and five members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. In addition to that, I thought it not improper to use a few minutes of time to call attention to the condition of the Treasury of the United States as I see it. Along last summer the Chief of the Bureau of the Budget estimated that there would be a deficit of \$94,000,000 in this fiscal year. I do not recall the exact date that he made that estimate, but some time during the summer. I know that at the time I was somewhat shocked at the result of the income and outgo of the Treasury, and while I made no effort at that time to ascertain the facts on which it was based, since I have arrived in Washington this fall I have done the best I could to find the cause, if there was a cause, for the revenues not equaling the expenditures.

I am in perfect agreement with the President of the United States when he suggests that it is a reflection upon the administration, and that means the Congress, and that means myself as well as others, for the Budget not to be met, and to have a deficit at the end of a fiscal year. Especially am I concerned about that since I was one of the Members who a year ago insisted on a larger reduction of taxes than the administration suggested. I feel that I was probably more responsible for that than the ordinary Member. Therefore I was very much concerned when I was told by the Chief of the Budget that there was to be a \$94,000,000 deficit for the year 1929. Arriving in Washington only two days before the meeting of Congress, I undertook to get what data I could concerning the condition of the Treasury, but before I could accumulate that data the President of the United States addressed his annual message to the Congress of the United States, and to my great surprise and gratification he told the Congress of the United States that, instead of there being a deficit, as the head of the Budget had suggested, that on July 1, 1929, there would be a surplus of \$37,000,000. I ceased my efforts to undertake to find out if the head of the Budget was correct and, if so, the basis on which he had made that estimate, because it was satisfactory to me that this Congress had not passed a tax reduction bill that impaired the credit of the United States to the extent of \$94,000,000 in a fiscal year.

I was very happy, I will say, to find myself in a position to see that reducing taxes much more than the administration said they should be reduced we still find ourselves with a handsome surplus on the 1st day of July, 1929. But to my great surprise, and I think a surprise to this House and to the country, six days later—in other words, on the 11th day of December—the President of the United States sent to this House a message with an estimate of \$75,000,000 increase in expenditures for this fiscal year, creating a deficit of some fifty-odd million dollars. I say, I was astounded at it, and I believe it was a surprise to this House and to the entire country, and I wondered how it was possible for the Treasury to make a mistake over a period of six days of \$75,000,000. Now, remember, that the President when he sent his message to the Congress based his estimate on the Treasury figures, could not have done it otherwise.

It is impossible for the President to send to this House a message as to the condition of the Treasury on what the sur-

plus would be without basing his figures on the Treasury report. So on the 4th day of December, 1928, the President of the United States said we would have a surplus of \$37,000,000, and on the 11th day of the same month he says, "I made a mistake when I submitted that, saying we would have a surplus of \$37,000,000; we are going to have a deficit of \$55,000,000." The question comes immediately why this mistake was made. Why was it that in the summer we had \$94,000,000 deficit and on the meeting of the Congress we had \$37,000,000 surplus, and six days later we had \$55,000,000 deficit. There must be some reason, gentlemen. These mistakes can not be made in a hodgepodge way. I am going to give you my deduction of it. I am going to give my reason, nothing but circumstantial evidence, but I will call the attention of the membership of this body who have been here some years, and I have repeatedly charged on the floor of this House, and the facts have borne out every charge, that the Secretary of the Treasury invariably makes his estimates to support the views and legislation he wants to get from this House. When he wanted to defeat the soldiers' bonus he estimates a deficit of around \$600,000,000. Ninety days afterwards, when there was an occasion to show there was plenty of money on hand, he estimated a surplus of something like \$300,000,000—\$900,000,000 in 90 days. Now we have his estimate at the rate of a mistake of ten millions a day, which is at least a reduction of \$80,000,000 per day from what it was about five years ago; but in every instance in this House when we have had under consideration tax reduction and tax consideration the Secretary of the Treasury has made his estimate to fit his desires. And his estimates have not panned out. The Secretary of the Treasury was interested in one piece of legislation in this Congress. So far as the Record shows, he was particularly interested in one piece of legislation that involved the Treasury. That was the loan to a foreign country of \$12,000,000. The Secretary of the Treasury is a shrewd man. He and his advisers understand the psychology of this House. He knew then that unless he could have the President of the United States tell Congress that it had a surplus and we could loan the money to a foreign country in time of peace without a bond issue or levying any additional tax he could not have passed that bill.

He knew that if the President of the United States told the Congress that we are going to have a deficit of fifty-odd million dollars this fiscal year that he could not have induced you to pass the Greek loan bill, because you would not have loaned money to a foreign country out of a busted Treasury, and he knew the country would have condemned you for it; but in order to induce you to pass it, in order to secure the legislation that he wanted, he made a misleading and, the facts show, it seems to me, a deliberately false statement as to what the prospects of your Treasury would be on the 1st day of July, 1929. He said on the 4th day of December, 1928, that we would have a surplus of \$37,000,000, and within seven days from that date he included an estimate that he had the President send to this House, an additional estimate, for \$75,000,000, creating a deficit of about fifty-odd million dollars. Did the Secretary of the Treasury on the 4th day of December of this year know that there was going to be a deficit? I will undertake to prove that he did. Then if he knew that there was going to be a deficit and he permitted the President to tell the Congress and the country that there was going to be a surplus, what is your conclusion as to the character of information that he gives to his President and to the Congress? Can you depend upon it?

I have tried to point out to you for six or seven years that you could not depend upon the estimates of the Treasury Department if it would have adverse bearing on its proposed legislation. It makes its figures to fit its views on legislation. I say that is not only misleading but it is dishonest.

I think I had better tell the House just in a moment the reason why I am making this talk. When on December 17 we met out in that little committee room in the northeast corner of the Capitol, the joint committee, composed of five Members of the House and five Members of the Senate, I gave notice and said to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], "What we do the Congress ought to know about it. I do not believe in these executive sessions." I think when I am to act officially representing the Congress of the United States in committee work I want the House to know of my action, and I do not want any secrecy or closed doors about it. So I asked that a stenographer be present.

A stenographer was on hand when we met on the 17th day of December this year. Then the Treasury officials, when they were in there—there were about a half dozen of them—were asked whether or not there was anything going to be said that might injure the Treasury. I do not know what they meant by



injuring the Treasury—whether it referred to individuals or their reputation or the finances of the Treasury. Anyway, they came to the conclusion in the discussion that something might be said that would affect taxpayers whose cases are still pending. I think that is a correct statement. I do not see Mr. COLLIER here at the moment, or Mr. HAWLEY. They were there, however, and if I have made a misstatement I hope they will call my attention to it. So we decided not to take down the testimony.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Treasury officials were asked if they could talk as freely under the law if a stenographer were present as they could to the committee when no stenographer was present. They said that under the law they were not permitted to make public certain matters relating to returns. As the gentleman knows, certain matters must not be made public under the law. For that reason a stenographer was not in attendance.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I accept the gentleman's statement. But there were others, I know, who said that when certain subjects come up that should not be taken down the custom was to say to the stenographer, "Just lift your pen." But that was not done. So our hearing was held for four hours without a stenographer, and I said I would tell, so far as my memory went, what occurred in that conference. I wanted the House of Representatives to know it.

I repeat, that on the 4th day of December of this year, under his duty to the Congress, the President sent here a message, and he was proud—read that message—he was particularly proud of the fact that he would have no financial disgrace of a deficit. He based that statement upon information received from the Secretary of the Treasury. On that same day—on that identical day, the 4th of December, 1928—the Treasury Department was certifying to this joint committee a refund to the United States Steel Corporation of \$15,752,442.55, which had to be paid in addition to what had already been paid. It was one item in the \$75,000,000 of additional estimate of expense sent to Congress on the 4th day of December. The President of the United States told the Congress there was \$37,000,000 surplus on that same day. On that identical day his Secretary of the Treasury sent papers to this Congress showing an additional \$75,000,000 as necessary to run the Government for the fiscal year.

Gentlemen, I do not know what you think about it, but I imagine that if the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] were President of the United States and he had a Secretary of the Treasury that misled him to the extent of \$75,000,000, when he had the correct information in his hand at the moment, he would have called him upon the carpet, and I know if I could transpose myself into that position I would call for his resignation on the ground of negligence or misinformation on the part of the man occupying the great position of Secretary of the Treasury.

Now, I want to talk to you for a moment about this settlement, because that is what we were called to pass upon. We had a hearing. Let me tell you the genesis of it. Back in 1924, as I recall, we inserted in the tax bill what is known as the publicity clause, requiring the publicity of income-tax returns. That law continued in effect until the 1926 act; or maybe it was in 1923-24. Anyway, somewhere within the last seven years we passed a publicity clause. A great many people in this country thought it did not work very well. I am not certain myself that it did. I have had very little experience and observation in the matter, so that I can not act as a witness in the case. But it was complained about, and Congress decided to repeal it, and they substituted for it, in order to satisfy certain gentlemen in another body, what was known as the proper means of securing information from the Treasury, and that was to give the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate and the joint committee the right of securing information from the department. For that purpose we put a clause in there. The original clause was that all refunds should be reported to this joint committee. Well, they said that would mean a lot of work, and a provision was inserted later omitting everything less than \$75,000. Everything over that they must report.

The result is that they have sent estimates up here for refunds in excess of \$75,000 and made that report to this committee. This committee, you remember, has no power. It can only express its opinion. So these reports have been coming up, and a man by the name of Parker, who used to work in the Treasury, I believe, and who is, as I understand, an expert accountant and said to be a very capable man, and who was with the Couzens committee at the time they made an examination of

the Treasury, is one of the principal men Mr. HAWLEY has in his joint committee office. When this report was sent up here Mr. Parker wrote a letter and said, "This thing is of such magnitude that I do not feel like taking the responsibility of passing on it."

He had been passing on all the others, simply letting them go by, making no particular comment one way or the other. But he did not feel like passing on this because it was too big a thing. So Mr. HAWLEY, agreeing with that, said, "I will call the joint committee to consider it." And he did. On last Monday we met and we had a hearing. I want to give you some of the facts we found. I want to say a word just here about one new man I have come in contact with in the Treasury Department, a man named Bond. I think he is one of the fairest men I have ever come in contact with. I believe he is a very able and efficient man; and there is one thing he will do, gentlemen, he will tell you the truth and I believe he will tell you the whole truth. I am afraid some of them in the Treasury Department do not give you the whole picture. They may tell you the whole truth if you will dig it out of them with an awl and gimlet, but they will not tell you the whole truth unless you force it; but I am inclined to think this man, Bond, is one who will, because he did not try to keep anything back; he gave us the whole facts and let us be responsible for our action upon them.

In 1917 we enacted in this country what is known as the excess-profits tax. Under that law every company was required to make its return for 1917. The United States Steel Corporation—I wish I had a blackboard like we had down in the committee. Being simple children, being Members of the Senate and House and not knowing much about this, we had a big blackboard which the Treasury officials used; and, by the way, that gave us a better insight into it than I believe would otherwise have been obtained. In 1917 the United States Steel Corporation made a report of its excess profits and income taxes. We had both, you remember. We had a 6 per cent income tax and an excess-profits tax, as I recall, running to 80 or 90 per cent. They made a report. They voluntarily reported to the Treasury of the United States that they had a net income, subject to taxation, of \$568,964,000. That is what the United States Steel Corporation reported to the Treasury of the United States under oath as their net income subject to the application of the income tax and the excess-profits tax for that year. Well, you would think that if they made that report and no additional laws were passed or anything exempting them from taxation that they would pay those taxes. They made this voluntarily and they made no protest on those taxes. Now, what is meant by a protest? The record shows that not one single suggestion was made by the United States Steel Corporation that they had paid too much in taxes for a period of two years. They paid taxes in 1921 and they did not make any protest until that date.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. Was it not stated at the hearing that whenever the taxes were paid, which were paid promptly thereafter, a claim for refund was filed for overpayments, which satisfied the condition of the law?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. All right. In answer to that, there was not a claim filed for refunds until 1923. I will show you what it was, and let me get this letter to do it. I got a letter from them this morning, and I think I am going to want some more time if I am to go into this as fully as I want to go into it. This is a letter received this morning from Mr. Henry Herrick Bond, one of the frankest men I have found in the Treasury Department, and I believe a very efficient man. The first application was made February 23, 1923, for taxes paid in 1917.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. Was not that within the legal period?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Oh, I do not deny that. I am not trying to plead the statute of limitations. I am just trying to convince you and illustrate that the United States Steel Corporation did not think they had any money coming to them until 1923 and never was allowed a refund until 1925. The most remarkable thing about this situation is that in 1925 the largest refund ever known in the history of this country was made immediately after the election. Now, after permitting the President to misrepresent the situation to the Congress, the Treasury now comes in and asks for \$75,000,000 for refunds on claims that have been pending for taxes paid 10 years ago. Is there nothing which indicates that there must be some kind of manipulation about this? Does it strike you that this thing just naturally happens that way? Would it strike an ordinary jury, if you were trying a man for his liberty, that these things just come around that way? Gentlemen, they do not naturally

happen that way. They have already been permitted a refund of \$31,000,000 on 1917 taxes. The United States Steel Corporation, which never asked for any refund for five years after paying taxes, has already been allowed \$31,000,000 on that particular year, 1917, and this \$15,000,000 plus the interest, making \$26,000,000, is in addition to the \$31,000,000 that they have already gotten into their exchequer and probably paid out in dividends, which have been allowed as a credit on taxes that have been coming along during these years. Here is one company in the United States, large, it is true, that gets a refund. I learned the reason it took so long to arrive at the amount of taxes owed by the company.

I want to tell you gentlemen about it. They said it was on account of the consolidated and affiliated return. I want you who struck out that provision in the 1928 act to think of that. The Treasury now admits—and I want somebody to challenge this if it is not so—that the most difficult phase of the excess-profits and income tax of corporations is the consolidated and affiliated return. It has taken 10 years to figure this out for one company.

I want to repeal that. That is one good thing you can do; that is one way you can hasten matters, by repealing the consolidated and affiliated return provision; and you can get honest taxation that way, too. Remember that.

Ah, how they shift. Just let me show you what I got this morning. Listen to this:

DEAR MR. GARNER: I inclose list of claims filed by the United States Steel Corporation for the years 1917–1920, inclusive, which we believe to be complete. You will appreciate that there is considerable duplication in these claims.

I also inclose a statement relative to the pending claims for refunds on excess-profits tax years by all taxpayers, which is as complete as we have been able to prepare in the limited time available.

If you desire further information, kindly advise me.

Gentlemen, I did not get this until about 10 o'clock this morning, and I only had time to glance at it, but I notice they give here a long list of applications for refunds by the United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries, and they make this statement:

In addition to the above claims filed by parent company, claims were filed for the year 1917 by the subsidiary corporations as follows.

Look at this list—\$5,500,000 for the American Sheet & Tin Plate Co.—and it runs all the way down the list, comprising tens of millions of dollars for refunds filed by the subsidiaries for the year 1917.

Why, of course it took them a long time to figure this out; but the worst part about it, and the thing I want to condemn, is that you do not know what they are doing in the Treasury Department. Nobody in this country knows anything about it. This little information that ekes out now and then is all the information we get.

Gentlemen—you Republicans—if you do not want some official body to break into the Treasury Department and “spill the beans,” you had better prepare some way whereby Congress can get information about what is going on in the Treasury Department. Mark my prediction! The American people will not tolerate the continued secrecy, the continued machinations in that department, the continual mutterings that come out of that department.

I have been driven to this conclusion. I hated to believe it; but, sir, I say that every indication shows that the Secretary of the Treasury is administering this law so as to make it so disagreeable to the American people that they will repeal it, because he is not in sympathy with it.

I have heard a good deal in the last three or four months about putting men in charge of the enforcement of the law who are not in sympathy with it. There is a good deal in that statement and I think it is one that appeals to a great many people in this country if we may take the returns of the last general election. If this is true, we know that the present Secretary of the Treasury is not in sympathy with the estate tax or the graduated income tax, and yet you leave in his hands, you turn over to this man the enforcement and the administration of a law that he dislikes, and he makes it so detestable, he makes it so obnoxious, and is making it so obnoxious to the American people, that he and his associates hope to make it so bad that the American people will demand its repeal and go to some other system that he believes is a better system.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Under the present law Congress requires all expenditures of the Government to be audited by an independent agency—the Comptroller General.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Would it not be wise that all of these refunds, especially all over a reasonable amount, should be audited by the same independent auditing agency?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Well, ordinarily, I would say yes, to my friend from Texas, but I will tell you that that is a difficult thing to do. It means duplication of work that would be stupendous and extremely expensive.

I realize that in this identical case it has taken a great deal of labor, and what I want to bring to your attention is the system existing in the Treasury Department that I believe is vicious, bad, and can result in no good to the Treasury.

This is the system. How did they settle this case? They did not settle it by any definite rule. They did not settle it by statute. They settled it by four processes, as admitted by them. They settled it by bargaining with the taxpayer. You have got a bargaining outfit at the Treasury Department, which is admitted to be so. If I am making any mistake I want you gentlemen, members of the joint committee, to call my attention to it.

It was admitted by the Treasury Department in this hearing that they bargained with the taxpayers as to how much they should pay, and they thought that was the better way to settle this matter.

You can understand why there are so many tax attorneys swarming around Washington when the question of what the taxpayer shall pay is not how much he owes, but how much he can get in an agreement with the department instead of how much the law requires.

Gentlemen, I agreed to a provision in the last bill, and I am still debating in my own mind whether I did right or not. When I analyze the Treasury Department and analyze its faults and misleading estimates in order to carry through legislation, its settlements with taxpayers on a bargain counter, I doubt whether I should have agreed to section 606 in the tax law of 1928. Do you know what that does? Oh, it is the greatest power ever given to one man in the way of handling Government finances. The Secretary of the Treasury tomorrow can have a settlement with a taxpayer, and although the taxpayer may owe \$10,000,000, he can settle by the taxpayer paying only \$1, and under this law the Secretary of the Treasury can sign the agreement and the people of the United States are forever barred from collecting the balance of that money, although we might find they had made a mistake. Why did I agree to that? Why, my friends, because the Treasury Department was breaking down of its own weight, and it was either a question of giving them this relief, as they said, or in the course of time the American people would demand the repeal of this law because they were breaking down of their own weight. Twenty-one thousand cases were pending before the Board of Tax Appeals and 163,000 were pending in the Treasury Department. Something had to be done, and the Secretary of the Treasury and his advisers said, “If you will give us this discretion, we will settle these cases,” and I agreed to do it.

I deliberately charge the Secretary of the Treasury with making this law so onerous to certain taxpayers that it will become so disagreeable to the American people that they will repeal the estate tax, the graduated income tax, and adopt some other system of getting revenue to run the Government.

I have heard Republicans say that the way the law was being administered undoubtedly the American people would soon repeal it. I believe this is the best system that we can get to have capital pay its part. I do not want to see it repealed. I do not want to see it so administered that the people will demand its repeal—not on account of the law itself but on account of the maladministration of the law. If it is ever repealed it will not be on account of the demerits of the law but on account of the demerits of those charged with its administration.

Now, gentlemen, the voluntary return by the United States Steel Corporation was that their capital was \$1,400,000,000. They made an amended return in 1919 for taxes in 1917, and cut down their capital to \$1,173,000,000. Under three years exhaustive audit by the ablest men in the country they found that the invested capital in the concern was \$1,096,000,000. They first said that they had a net income of \$568,000,000. They finally whittled it down until by the final report it was \$479,000,000—almost a mistake in the United States Steel Co. alone in the net income of 1917 of \$100,000,000 in one year.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended 30 minutes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I will say to the gentleman I do not want as much time as that, but I will take 15 minutes.



The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Now, gentlemen on the Republican side of the House, you would have thought that after this hearing, this settlement would have been approved—there are six Republicans and four Democrats on the joint committee. What happened? I can not give you all the facts that we got in four hours, but we went into executive session. Did they approve it? That was what they were called for, to approve it or disapprove it. No; they did not approve it. The chairman, good man, innocent, nothing the matter with him, never had an idea or thought of doing anything wrong, but if Andrew Mellon and his crowd said that the horse was 16 hands high, he would say "Well, I never saw one as high as that, but if they declare that he was 16 hands high, why he must be 16 hands high." [Laughter.]

He was willing to approve it, and willing to approve everything they suggested about it; he never refused a single request.

But there was a gentleman there from the city of Pittsburgh, where the Carnegie company is located, a gentleman from Pennsylvania by the name of Reed, who said he could not take the responsibility of approving this thing. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, there must be something the matter with it; there must be something wrong with that settlement if you could not get the United States Steel Co. with its subsidiary in Pittsburgh to be approved by a Senator from that State who has unjustly been charged with being the creature of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Would you not have thought, if he could not approve it, that I ought to have some doubt about approving it? Mr. COLLIER and I sat together and waited for them to move. They first moved its approval, and Mr. REED said, "I can not do it." Then they looked around and said, "This is going to fail," and then it would be putting the fat into the fire, and finally Mr. HAWLEY said, "Mr. GARNER, you make a motion." He wanted me to make a motion to approve it. I said, "No; I have got no motion to make." [Laughter.] So he withdrew the motion to approve it because he could not get enough to have it approved, and he said, "Let us adjourn," and we adjourned. The Republicans of that joint committee declined to approve the settlement made by the Secretary of the Treasury with the United States Steel Corporation by which the total amount that will be refunded to that company under this settlement for that fiscal year, including interest, is more than \$65,000,000! Think of it! One company receives a refund on the taxes it paid the Government for one fiscal year to the amount of \$65,000,000—returned to it because of a mistake! Gentlemen, it is too stupendous to comprehend. That is not all. Mr. Bond was frank enough when I asked him the question. I said, "How much more, Mr. Bond, will you have to pay the United States Steel Corporation if you make the settlement on that basis?" He said, "If we continue to settle the other cases for 1918, 1919, and 1920 on that basis, it will be about \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000," and when I asked him when he was going to pay it, he said if the settlements were made in time that it would be paid in this fiscal year. I shall put in the data for 1918, 1919, and 1920. In effect, his statement means the Treasury is going to make such a deficit this fiscal year so that the Congress will never forget it. You are not only going to settle \$15,000,000, but, if settled on that basis, this one company alone will be settled with to the extent of \$28,000,000 to \$30,000,000 more, and be paid this year.

I make this statement, that the Secretary of the Treasury can, by manipulating the refunds and accelerating the collections, make a difference of \$100,000,000 in any fiscal year that he wants to. Could he not have put off the payment of this \$75,000,000 a little longer? Why did he not do it? I do not know, but there may be something in the back of his head to the effect that after the 4th of March he might not have a chance. I do not know whether that is it, but I do know this—that he is in great haste to settle these cases that have been pending for 10 years. It would seem to me that he could have let it go over just 90 days more, and let a new administration do some of the refunding in place of the old. It might have been advisable. Or, in order not to disgrace this Republic as the President has suggested, with a deficit, he could have let it go over until July 1, in place of doing it now. He could have done that.

There is now law that compels him to make this approval. He could have carried it over, Mr. LONGWORTH; he could have kept this Congress and this administration from going before the world with a deficit on the 1st day of July. Nobody is responsible for it except the Secretary of the Treasury, and I say that if I were President of the United States and he deliberately fixed it so that I would have to reverse myself in such a way, I would

ask for his reasons. I would never permit myself to be treated in such a manner as the Secretary of the Treasury has treated the President of the United States within the last 30 days—telling him on December 4, "Sir, you tell the Congress that you have \$37,000,000," and now, on the 11th of December telling him that a mistake has been made of \$75,000,000. They made a mistake of \$75,000,000 in six days, or about \$12,500,000 a day.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I don't know whether the gentleman stated it or not, but the vote on the Greek settlement bill was on the 10th, and the House was not aware of the reversal of the Treasury figures until after that vote was taken.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes; that is correct. I do not believe that you are entitled to misrepresent in order to get legislation through or to defeat legislation. I know that we can fix our consciences by withholding information, saying that it is the other fellow's duty to get it, and that we will not give it to him; but that is not as bad as giving misinformation in order to induce you to vote one way or the other.

Now, gentlemen, I do not know what you are going to do. If you were the Secretary of the Treasury, and Congress had created a joint committee to pass on refunds that you had arranged, and that committee after a called session and a hearing of four hours, declined to give you a clean bill of health, declined to say that it would indorse your settlement, would you not have hesitated to continue a settlement of that kind? But they will not do it. Do you know what he is going to say? I know. He is going to say that he will take the responsibility.

Gentlemen, for the last six or seven years he has been the most powerful man in the world. I say that he can take the responsibility because he does not care whether you are coming out with a deficit if he can pass the Greek bill. But you ask, "What is the use?" I do not know that I can answer that question. I do not know even what is the use of making these statements, but I took the floor this morning because there was no stenographic report of that case, and I wanted you to have some conception of what is going on. If you had had a report of it, so that you could read it, you would be able to get your information there. In addition to that, I want to call attention to what seemed to me to be one more estimate from the Treasury Department that was a mistake, and that is the mildest term that I can call it—one more estimate from the Treasury Department that was a mistake—a mistake of \$75,000,000 over a period of less than seven days.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I will.

Mr. LOZIER. I would like to ask the gentleman in the whole history of the American Republic has there ever been a single instance in the administration of Albert Gallatin, Alexander Hamilton, and other great Secretaries of the Treasury where there was such erroneous statements made as to revenues of the Government that have been made in the last few years by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I am sorry I can not answer the question, because I am not familiar enough with that history. I know this, that the Secretary of the Treasury has given back more money to the big taxpayers than all the other Secretaries of the Treasury since the beginning of this Republic. I can say more than that. He has given back to these special taxpayers since the election of 1924 more money than in the history of this Republic, and it seems a greater proportion after election than any other period—\$75,000,000 even six days after the meeting of Congress, a month after election. Do you approve of that settlement?

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I will.

Mr. GIFFORD. Having talked with the gentleman a little about it, I would like to ask if the committee which was called in to approve this settlement could not decide from the actual merits of the case, did actually decide just like a bargain counter?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I say the Treasury Department run under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury as it is now is adopting no definite rule or law to guide it and making bargain settlements, is in a chaotic condition.

You do not want to cheat the United States Steel Corporation, and I do not want to cheat it. I want to treat it just like every other taxpayer of this Nation, although it may be the largest one in this Nation, it is entitled to the same consideration as the man who pays only one dollar.

I say we owe as much duty to the United States Steel Corporation to protect it against paying too much taxes as any man in this House, but, sirs, you can not justify this system of bar-

gaining in the Treasury Department. No man can do it. You will find that if it is continued they will continue to swarm here with multiplied attorneys to bring what influence they can to bear upon a bargain counter. I do not believe it is a good system. [Applause.]

#### ARMY PROMOTIONS

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by way of an explanation of what is known as the McSwain amendment to the Wainwright bill relating to promotions in the Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, justice will finally win by its own inherent power. Truth, although slow, like the mills of the gods, will eventually take possession of the minds of the people. These remarks will be very apropos in connection with the bill known as the Wainwright bill, with the McSwain amendment, known as H. R. 13509.

In 1920 the Congress by the national defense act directed that the officer strength of the Regular Army be practically doubled. The sections of that act especially pertinent to this inquiry are sections 24, 24a, and 24b, and we naturally desire to know whether or not the War Department properly understood and executed the will of Congress in connection with this law. When the promotion list as arranged by the War Department was finally published in 1921 it was discovered that as to the ranks of captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant, all officers of these three ranks were commingled and intermingled one with the other so that in hundreds of cases second lieutenants and first lieutenants were arranged upon the promotion list higher up than some captains. This meant as vacancies should occur these first lieutenants and second lieutenants would be promoted to grade of major before those captains whom they preceded on the promotion list would become majors.

Now, there are about 900 emergency captains that were thus put upon the promotion list below first lieutenants and second lieutenants of the Regular Army, and about 900 emergency first lieutenants that were placed upon the list below second lieutenants of the Regular Army. The statistics show that these 900 captains are, on the average, about 10 years older than those lieutenants who precede them upon the promotion list. All this first became known in 1921, after the emergency officers had already accepted their commissions and had entered upon their service, and thus entirely severed all connection with their civilian pursuits and were understood by their neighbors, friends, and business associates as having entered the Regular Army for the rest of their lives. Thus it was hard for them to change their plans again so quickly, and therefore as a class they did not resign from the Army after discovering the injustice that had been done, but continued to serve faithfully and loyally in the belief that the War Department itself would see its mistake and correct its wrong, or that Congress itself would by legislation correct the mistake.

This intermingling of officers without regard to rank did not prevail in the higher ranks. Some emergency officers received commissions as colonels in the Regular Army and they were arranged among the colonels. In like manner some emergency officers were appointed lieutenant colonels and were arranged among lieutenant colonels of the Regular Army. The same arrangement was observed as to emergency officers appointed majors. The law itself provided that a suitable number of emergency officers should be appointed in each of the grades below brigadier general, to be selected according to their "qualifications" for their respective grades according to the decision of a board of general officers. To show that Congress expected that age and experience should count and be respected it provided that no person below 48 years of age should be appointed colonel and no person below 45 years should be appointed lieutenant colonel and no person below the age of 36 should be appointed major. When the War Department sent out instructions to examining boards throughout the country it expressly stipulated that the board should give examinations corresponding to the ranks applied for. In other words, there should be one kind of examination for major and another kind with less range of subjects for captain and another kind with still less range for lieutenant. Section 24a of the act provided that a uniform system of promotion for officers was to be based on "equity, merit, and the interests of the Army as a whole." When it was provided in subdivision 4 of section 24a that emergency captains and lieutenants appointed to the Regular Army under this act should be placed according to commission service among the captains and lieutenants of the Regular Army no one ever thought that the War Department would construe and interpret this language of subdivision 4 as it

did. All our thinking and observation of military matters proceeds upon the invariable rule that rank should be respected in promotion.

The Members of Congress who enacted the law understood this principle, and the emergency officers so understood it, and the public generally so understood it. It was therefore a startling and shocking interpretation which the War Department placed upon the language of the act. It was so shocking that some of us not directly in touch with the Army could not realize for several years just what had happened. The relatives and friends of emergency officers that had been thus treated would make their complaint to us from time to time, but we never fully understood for several years just what had been done. We waited then for the War Department to suggest legislation to correct this glaring and manifest injustice. The War Department appointed numerous boards and made numerous studies, but the outcome of the matter was always that the correction of this injustice, which was freely admitted by the War Department, would work an injustice to others, and therefore recommended that no rearrangement be made.

I specifically deny that the correction of an injustice to one man can ever be an injustice to the other man that has been the beneficiary of the original act of injustice. To illustrate: If a lower court erroneously and illegally decides that a tract of land belongs to John Smith and puts John Smith in possession of the land, and then an appeal is taken, and after several crops have been produced on the land rent free by John Smith the Supreme Court reverses the court below and decides that in equity, justice, and merit the land belongs to William Jones, how can it be an injustice to require Smith to surrender possession of land he never should have possessed? In fact, a court of equity would require John Smith to account for rents and profits.

But officers that were first lieutenants and second lieutenants in the Regular Army at the time the national defense act was passed in 1920 and who on account thereof were promoted as of July 1, 1920, to be captains and to take rank over those emergency captains, who on an average are about 10 years older, will not themselves be reduced in rank. These young captains will continue to be captains. Under the ruling of the War Department these lieutenants became captains at an average age of about 25 years. Having been in the Army since 1917, they were thus on an average about 22 years when commissioned as second lieutenants. Relatively few of them had had any previous military training; most of them were just out of college and a few of them had been working for a salary for about a year. Certainly some of them had only a high-school education. I have yet to learn of one of them that had been carrying on any independent and separate business of his own in the competitive business world. Not many of them had begun any profession and a few were working for salaries, and thus taking orders from others. Doubtless, they were as much surprised to find themselves quickly jumped to be captains so early in life as the captains 10 years older were surprised to find themselves ranked by these young captains. These younger captains will continue captains, and if the Wainwright bill passes as amended, then practically all of them will be promoted to be majors at about the same time. The older captains will be higher ranking captains and will be higher ranking majors as they ought to be.

I deny the argument made by Major Summers of the General Staff at the hearings that all new officers should come into the Army as second lieutenants. Naturally, all the Regular Army officers would desire this to be done, but it has never been the practice in the American Army.

Andrew Jackson became a general in the Regular Army without any previous Regular Army rank. Frederick Funston was made a brigadier general, being his first commission in the Regular Army. Gen. Joe Wheeler resigned a lieutenantancy in the Regular Army in 1861, and in 1901 was commissioned brigadier general in the Regular Army. Leonard Wood resigned his commission as a surgeon in the Army and became colonel of volunteers, and thereafter was commissioned a brigadier general of the line. There are numerous other examples of how persons have been commissioned in various ranks of the Regular Army, and have been promoted along with Regular Army officers of the same rank. Therefore, it is unfair and unreasonable to permit the War Department to interpret the will of Congress so that persons now nearly 45 years of age on the average, and being commissioned as captains in 1920, find themselves preceded on the promotion list by captains on an average of 10 years younger. I deny that mere length of service in the Regular Army is a fair and reasonable test and measure of merit, and standard of what is best for the interests of the Army as a whole. The qualifications of the individual should be the primary test. Some persons may serve in the Regular Army 30 years or more



and never have one-tenth of the ability and skill as military leaders as other persons who have never served in the Regular Army at all. It is ridiculous and absurd to assume that the merely holding of a commission in the Regular Army confers ability, character, and the quality of leadership. All history and experience assert the contrary; and, in fact, these captains now nearly 45 years old as an average brought into the Regular Army their business and professional experience and training. They are very useful and valuable to the Regular Army. These older captains had been business men, insurance agents, and farmers, real estate agents, and brokers, and thus had a varied experience with the competitive business world. Furthermore, as a class they are well educated.

Their examinations show their educations, showed what colleges they had attended, showed what business they had engaged in, and showed what service they had performed during the World War. I submit that the examination papers and the service records of these older captains permitted the War Department to know much more about them than it could know about the younger captains. The War Department naturally selected the most choice officers that applied for commissions from the many thousands that were seeking commissions. Furthermore, the record shows a large percentage of these older captains had either received military training while in school or had been commissioned officers in the National Guard. All this training was valuable preparation for their intensive instruction in the training camps. At least one of these captains graduated at a good military school, held a commission in the National Guard for about 10 years, had become colonel of his regiment, and was with that regiment when it was inducted into Federal service in 1917. This particular individual possessed preeminent qualifications to be a major, but it so happened that on July 1, 1920, he lacked a few days of being 36 years old, the minimum set by the law as above stated. But at the same time there were many Regular Army officers that became majors on or about July 1, 1920, at the age of 28. Thus they held that a Regular Army officer with no business and professional training, with little if any knowledge of the competitive business world, was qualified to be a major at 28, but an emergency officer, who had been out in the business world, who had been gainfully employed in support of his family, who had been trained in the National Guard and in military schools, all at his own expense, and who had had as much experience in combat during the World War as any Regular Army officer, could not become a major unless 36 years old. This was a direct and conspicuous discrimination against the emergency officer. It is true that this age requirement was written into the law, but it only shows how Congress followed some one's suggestion and advice, and legislated in such a way as to prejudice the emergency officer. The question ought to be "qualifications," and where the qualifications are equal, age ought to have priority. But the War Department has ignored the question of qualifications, and had disregarded that wisdom and knowledge which age and experience bring, and had applied the arbitrary and meaningless and unreasonable standard of "length of commissioned service."

Members of Congress need not deceive themselves nor be deceived by others as to the real point of contention in this matter. Though there may be some collateral issues, resting upon individual cases, yet its main issue, the chief bone of contention, lies between the emergency officers, now captains and first lieutenants who served in war in higher grades as a general proposition and with distinction during the war, and, on the other hand, the Regular Army officers, especially including many officers that entered by way of provisional second lieutenants, who are now captains and became captains, many of them, at about 25 years of age. Here is the real contention; the hearings show it; the records prove it; and the correspondence of individual members on this subject with officers and relatives and friends of officers, when correctly analyzed and understood, will prove it.

Unfair and unjust as is the situation now, its unreasonableness and absurdity will be more manifest if we project ourselves 10 or 15 years into the future, as we must. At that time these emergency officer captains will be 55 or 60 years of age and will still be captains. These Regular Army officers, who claim that their rights will be invaded by the adoption of my amendment, will be 45 or 50 years of age and practically all of them will be majors and some of them will be lieutenant colonels. These older officers, still captains, will have grandchildren attending the same post schools and playing on the same grounds with the children of these younger Regular Army officers. The younger officers, with small and younger families and no grandchildren, will be occupying the larger and more conspicuous houses, and the older officers, below them in grade and in pay, will be living with larger families in the smaller and

remote houses. This is a situation that will prove mortifying and embarrassing to these older emergency officers, and especially so to their wives, children, and grandchildren.

The contrast will be so conspicuous as to demand constant explanation. To the minds of children, grandchildren, and neighbors and friends, the fact that the officers, though 10 years older, are outranked by one or two grades by the officers 10 years younger, will constitute an indictment of either the ability or the character, and perhaps of both, of the older officers. Children, grandchildren, relatives, and friends of these older captains will be constantly explaining and apologizing. This is a condition calculated to produce unrest and dissatisfaction. It will do more than destroy morale; it is calculated to produce mutiny, and nothing short of the fine quality of discipline in the hearts of these older emergency officers has preserved their loyalty and maintained their esprit de corps. I counsel forbearance and patience; I insist that Congress will right their wrongs.

Furthermore, I submit most respectfully and deferentially, but earnestly, that the quickness and ease with which these younger officers jumped, in the course of three years, from civilian life, and most of them just out of high school and college, to the permanent rank of captain, are not calculated to establish discipline in them nor to develop a seasoned morale, nor to build up a genuine esprit de corps. Why do I say this? Because what we obtain quickly and easily in contrast with others, we do not properly prize and appreciate. Already these same young captains are fretting at the bit, wishing to be made majors and thinking that they ought to be made majors; their rapid rise from zero in the military life to the rank, dignity, power, and income of a captain in the Regular Army, is unparalleled. Gen. Hunter Liggett had to serve 19 years to become a captain. Gen. Robert L. Bullard had to serve 15 years to become a captain. Gen. John F. Morrison had to serve 14 years to become a captain. Gen. John J. Pershing had to serve 15 years to become a captain; and these examples are fair standards of the time required of the officers of the generation that held high command and discharged great responsibility during the World War.

Again, these younger officers, though the natural spirit of selfishness and personal ambition forbid them to say so in words, yet in the bottom of their hearts, in the silence of the night, in the presence of eternal truth, they are obliged to realize that through a situation of circumstances that they did not control and therefore for which they are not to blame, they have become the favored beneficiaries of rapid promotion, with prospects of further promotion, and that their good fortune was at the cost of men who are on the average 10 years older and have therefore had wider experience and are better trained to exercise high command. This comparison is based on the reasonable assumption that the natural abilities and home training and education of the individuals in the two classes are approximately the same and without any known advantage to either class.

We do know, however, because the records show it, that these older officers, certainly a large per cent of them, had military training either in schools or as officers in the National Guard before April 6, 1917. Furthermore, their records show that they had professional and business experience, which are an important addition to the school education. On the contrary, these younger officers were but little beyond high school and college and with practically no responsible business and professional experience. How can there be any doubt as to the superiority of these older men to exercise command in the Army? Therefore, in the face of the very nature of the facts and in defiance of universally recognized principles concerning rank and promotion, the War Department put an interpretation upon the act of Congress that advances the younger and less qualified officers ahead of the older and better prepared officers. When these younger officers have had the same amount of experience 10 years hence they will surely be equal to these older officers.

It is ridiculous and absurd for any person to say that the various examinations of the former emergency officers in the Regular Army held generally in the fall of 1920, after the Congress by law had decided to double the number of officers in the Regular Army, were not to consider grades and ranks. The law stipulated that qualifications should count and by inference stipulated that age should count. The law required that some of these emergency officers should be appointed in all of the grades from colonel down. As a matter of fact, these boards did recommend the appointment of these emergency officers for commission in all of the grades. The instructions from the War Department said that, "the general qualifications from each applicant should not be limited to moral fitness, but should take into consideration experience, age, grade for which quali-

fied, and probable general value to the Government." Beyond the shadow of a doubt, and it is admitted by every general officer that has appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs, when an emergency officer applied for and took an examination for captaincy in the Regular Army, and was accepted and commissioned, he had a right to assume that he would be placed along with all other captains in the Regular Army, and arranged among all other captains according to length of their respective commissioned service. There was no more reason for him to think that he would find himself on the promotion list below first lieutenants and second lieutenants than he would have in thinking that he would be placed on the promotion list of persons listed as majors and lieutenant colonels. The rule has always been through our recorded history that colonels rank with colonels, majors rank with majors, captains with captains, and lieutenants with lieutenants.

Therefore when the War Department found that its interpretation of this act of Congress would conflict with these universally accepted and applied rules of military life the War Department should have hesitated, and should have called into consultation responsible Members of Congress, and should have ascertained what reason Congress could have had for contravening all of these well-accepted rules.

If they considered the language imperative there should have been a delay in action until the next session of Congress, and the mistakes of language in the act of June 4, 1920, should have been pointed out and Congress given a chance to clear up the language, so as not to make itself ridiculous, and so as not to compel the War Department to violate all military conceptions and to bring about a state in the Army of unrest, dissatisfaction, and low morale.

Speaking on this subject of promotion and retirement, Gen. Charles P. Summerall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, used this language:

The present condition is leading to a very unfortunate situation. It has been explained to you, and will be further explained in detail, that we have a large number of officers, who are representative American citizens and who have come from the mass of the people. Most of them have worked their way up in life. They have demonstrated by their service in a great war their ability to be officers, and they have deserved at the hands of the Government considerate and just treatment. They see, however, that before them is a hopeless future. The great majority must remain in grades not commensurate with their duties, their age, or their length of service. They will do what every man does under such circumstances—they will stagnate. They see themselves confronted by the problem of living. Every man in this country has a right to aspire to improve his scale of living, and because he finds himself initially in one scale of living he is not deprived of the right to seek a higher scale of living.

Again, General Summerall, speaking before the same committee, used the following language:

No man can command successfully American soldiers or officers unless they have confidence in his sense of justice. The Government, above all, must show them that it treats them according to reasonable standards of justice. You can not treat any man unjustly without arousing in him a sense of bitterness, resentment, and antagonism that will injure whatever native ability he may have.

Among the basic elements of human nature are ambition and a sense of justice. These are the stuff of business efficiency and they are no less indispensable in the military service. All countries have adopted a system of military grades, thus giving to each officer an opportunity to rise to a position commensurate with his ability, age, and length of service. This is called "promotion" and "rank." Relative to the high positions of civil life, such rewards are small, but they are more precious to the soldier than any material consideration.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

When the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads was called.

#### RECEIPTS FOR MAIL

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 56, which is on the Union Calendar and approved by the Post Office Department.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 56) to authorize the Postmaster General to issue receipts to senders for ordinary mail of any character, domestic or international, and to fix the fees chargeable therefor.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Postmaster General may provide by regulation for furnishing to the sender a receipt showing the mailing of ordinary mail of any class, domestic or international, and for the payment of such fee as he may prescribe for such receipt: *Provided*, That the furnishing of such receipt shall not place any liability on the Post Office Department or its revenues.

With a committee amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "domestic or international." Amend the title.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

#### EMERGENCY STAR-ROUTE SERVICE

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 57.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 57) to enable the Postmaster General to authorize the establishment of temporary or emergency star-route service from a date earlier than the date of the order requiring such service.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. The bill is on the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 8 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing the postal savings system, and for other purposes," approved May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 161), is hereby amended by adding thereto the following proviso:

"*Provided further*, That the provisions of section 3960, Revised Statutes, that no compensation shall be paid for additional service in carrying the mail until such additional service is ordered, the sum to be allowed therefor to be expressed in the order and entered upon the books of the department, and that no compensation shall be paid for any additional regular service rendered before the issuing of such order, shall not apply to any service authorized under this act."

With a committee amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "161," insert "United States Code, title 39, section 434."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

#### PAN AMERICAN POSTAL UNION

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 12415, on the Union Calendar, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up the bill H. R. 12415, and asks unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, may we have the bill reported first?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12415) to grant freedom of postage in the United States domestic service to the correspondence of the members of the Diplomatic Corps and consuls of the countries of the Pan American Postal Union stationed in the United States.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That under such regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe correspondence of the members of the Diplomatic Corps of the countries of the Pan American Postal Union stationed in the United States may be reciprocally transmitted in the domestic mails free of postage, and be entitled to free registration, but without any right to indemnity in case of loss. The same privilege shall be accorded consuls of such countries stationed in the United States and vice consuls when they are discharging the functions of such consuls, for the exchange of official correspondence among themselves, and for that which they direct to the Government of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?



There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

#### TRANSPORTATION OF FOREIGN MAIL

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 6864 on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.  
The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6864) to authorize the Postmaster General to require steamship companies to carry the mail when tendered

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 203, chapter 321, of the act of March 4, 1909, is amended by the addition of the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the Postmaster General may require the transportation by any steamships of mail between the United States and any foreign port at the compensation fixed under authority of law. Upon refusal by the master or the commander of such steamship or vessel to accept the mail, when tendered by the Postmaster General or his representative, the collector or other officer of the port empowered to grant clearance, on notice of the refusal aforesaid, shall withhold clearance until the collector or other officer of the port is informed by the Postmaster General or his representative that the master or commander of the steamship or vessel has accepted the mail or that conveyance by his steamship or vessel is no longer required by the Postmaster General."

With committee amendments as follows:

On page 1, beginning on line 3, strike out "that section 203, chapter 321, of the act of March 4, 1909, is amended by the addition of the following proviso: *Provided*, That the" and insert: "That section 203 of an act entitled 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States,' approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. L. 1127, U. S. C., title 18, sec. 326), is amended by adding to the end thereof the following new paragraph."

On page 2, line 1, at the beginning of the line insert the word "The."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HOGG. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, before the words "The Postmaster General," insert "except as otherwise provided by treaty or convention."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

#### POISONS IN THE MAIL

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 10441.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10441) to amend section 217, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 217, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, be amended to read as follows:

"All kinds of poison, and all articles and compositions containing poison, and all poisonous animals, insects, and reptiles, and explosives of all kinds, and inflammable materials, and infernal machines, and mechanical, chemical, or other devices or compositions which may ignite or explode, and all disease germs or scabs, and all other natural or artificial articles, compositions, or material, of whatever kind, which may kill or in any wise hurt, harm, or injure another, or damage, deface, or otherwise injure the mails or other property, whether sealed as first-class matter or not, are hereby declared to be nonmailable matter and shall not be conveyed in the mails or delivered from any post office or station thereof, nor by any letter carrier; but the Postmaster General may permit the transmission in the mails, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe as to preparation and packing, of any articles hereinbefore described which are not outwardly or of their own force dangerous or injurious to life, health, or property: *Provided*, That the transmission in the mails of poisonous drugs and medicines may be limited by the Postmaster General to shipments of such articles from the manufacturer thereof or dealer therein to licensed physicians, surgeons, dentists, pharmacists, druggists, and veterinarians, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe: *Provided further*, That all spirituous, vinous, malted, fermented, or other intoxicating liquors of any kind are hereby declared to be nonmailable and shall not be deposited in or carried through the mails. Whoever shall knowingly deposit or cause to be deposited for mailing or delivery, or shall knowingly cause to be delivered by mail, according to the direction thereon or at any place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to

whom it is addressed, anything declared by this section to be nonmailable, unless in accordance with the rules and regulations hereby authorized to be prescribed by the Postmaster General, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both; and whoever shall knowingly deposit or cause to be deposited for mailing or delivery, or shall knowingly cause to be delivered by mail, according to the direction thereon or at any place to which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, anything declared by this section to be nonmailable, whether transmitted in accordance with the rules and regulations authorized to be prescribed by the Postmaster General or not, with the design, intent, or purpose to kill or in any wise hurt, harm, or injure another, or damage, deface, or otherwise injure the mails or other property, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

#### SAFEGUARDING THE MAILS

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 13114.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up the bill H. R. 13114, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13114) to amend section 197 of the Criminal Code (sec. 320, title 18, U. S. C.)

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 197 of the Criminal Code (sec. 320, title 18, U. S. C.) as to read:

"Whoever shall assault any person having lawful charge, control, or custody of any mail matter, with intent to rob, steal, or purloin such mail matter or any part thereof, or shall rob or attempt to rob any such person of such mail or any part thereof, shall for the first offense be imprisoned not more than 25 years; and if in the effecting or attempting to effect such robbery he shall wound any person having custody of or engaged in safeguarding the mail or put his life in jeopardy with a dangerous weapon, he shall be imprisoned for life; and if in effecting or attempting to effect such robbery he shall kill any person having custody of or engaged in safeguarding the mail, he shall be punished by death."

With committee amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the word "as" and insert in lieu thereof the words "be amended."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the words "for the first offense."

Page 1, line 10, strike out after the word "in" the word "the."

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to me for a question?

Mr. KELLY. Certainly.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I want to ask about the effect of these committee amendments, especially the amendment dealing with the matter of first offenses.

Mr. KELLY. It is really to correct a typographical error. The original print of the bill should have contained the language as is now proposed, but by inadvertence it did not. It was the intention of the committee to omit the words "for the first offense" and provide imprisonment for not more than 25 years. This measure is urged by the Postmaster General as a means of dealing with the serious situation that confronts the department.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Did the committee consider making it a capital offense, within the discretion of the jury, where a robbery is committed with firearms?

Mr. KELLY. Yes; that was considered by the committee and it was finally decided that it would be best in the form in which the bill is reported. However, that provision was thoroughly considered and a draft containing it was before the committee.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not suppose there is any question as to jurisdiction between this committee and the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KELLY. I will say to the gentleman that it was unofficially stated to me by a member of the Judiciary Committee that the bill should have gone to that committee, but it deals with matters pertaining to the Post Office Department exclusively and it has already been acted upon by the Post Office Committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a parliamentary inquiry on that proposition. It seems to me that a bill of this gravity, a bill proposing to inflict capital punishment, should properly have gone to the Committee on the Judiciary, but I suppose the Speaker properly referred it to the

Post Office Committee. I do not want to raise the question of jurisdiction now and probably it is too late, but I think it is rather important that the record should be made clear on that point.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. It is too late to raise the question of jurisdiction.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I admitted it was probably too late to raise that question, but as it is a matter of considerable importance, I thought I would make an inquiry of the Chair and ascertain whether he was firm in his opinion that the bill originally was properly referred to the Post Office Committee.

Mr. KELLY. I will say that the bill deals exclusively with the Postal Service and so it was dealt with by the Post Office Committee.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I know, as a matter of practice, having for a number of years served on the Post Office Committee, that bills for the enactment of criminal statutes for offenses against the Post Office Department have invariably been referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recall the reference of this bill in the first instance, but inasmuch as it is the duty of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to report legislation relating to the Postal Service, and in view of the fact that this bill does not affect anything but the Postal Service, the Chair is inclined to think it was properly referred. In the future the Chair will undertake to examine very carefully bills relating to the Postal Service that carry the death penalty.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, that was my only purpose in making the inquiry, because it seemed a matter of considerable gravity.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will keep that in mind. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY: On page 1, line 6, after the word "of," add the words "or engaged in safeguarding."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the next committee.

The Clerk called the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate bill 3162.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. I yield.

Mr. TILSON. We should like very much to go ahead with the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture to-day and finish it. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business be dispensed with for the remainder of the day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business be dispensed with for the remainder of the day. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to submit a parliamentary inquiry. This committee would then have the next Calendar Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. The committee would have the next two Calendar Wednesdays.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15386) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15386, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. LUCE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Market inspection of farm products: For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, or other associations of business men or trade organizations, and persons or corporations engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, whether operating in one or more jurisdictions, to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested parties the class, quality, and/or condition of cotton and fruits, vegetables, poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm products when offered for interstate shipment or when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered: *Provided*, That certificates issued by the authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained, \$420,000.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do this for the purpose of eliciting some information from the chairman of the subcommittee. I received a letter this morning from the commissioner of agriculture of our State, who is very much concerned about the insects that are bothering our bulb culture in the eastern part of the United States, and particularly in North Carolina.

I notice in the report, Mr. Chairman, you say for the investigation of bulb insects in the East, \$7,500. This is confined to the whole eastern section of the United States, is it not?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. That is for the whole eastern section where they have bulb culture. There are about four States that produce bulbs in the eastern section, New York, New Jersey, Virginia, and North Carolina, and this is for investigation of the diseases that are prevalent in those States on the eastern coast.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I would like, Mr. Chairman, the privilege of inserting in my remarks this letter from our commissioner of agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Raleigh, December 15, 1928.

Hon. CHARLES L. ABERNETHY,  
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ABERNETHY: It is my understanding that the Bureau of Entomology of the Federal department asked the Bureau of the Budget for an item of \$15,000 to be used in the studies of bulb insects affecting narcissus and other related bulbs which are now being grown to a large extent in North Carolina and Virginia. I am just informed that the Bureau of the Budget did not include this item, but that it did include an item of \$15,000 for the study of bulb insects on the Pacific coast, and an appropriation for the study of bulb fungus diseases on Long Island.

Within the last few years the bulb industry has grown very extensively in North Carolina, as will be seen from the following quotation from a recent report of the Federal Horticultural Board:

"Omitting the paper-white narcissus, Chinese sacred lily, and Soleil d'Or, which are confined to the Southern States and are known as polyanthus types, the figures for the States having more than 1,000,000 of the hardy daffodil types, are as follows:

New York	7,740,706
Washington	7,147,280
Oregon	5,452,310
Michigan	4,550,900
Virginia	4,032,200
Texas	3,987,000
New Jersey	3,947,600
North Carolina	2,777,600
Illinois	2,403,162
California	1,362,510
Ohio	1,208,025

Total for the United States..... 45,462,727

"According to the annual reports of the Federal Horticultural Board, it appears that 12,575,730 narcissus bulbs were imported into the United States during the fiscal year 1927-28, and that of this number 1,525,858 reached the State of Virginia."

North Carolina is vitally interested in a study of these bulb problems. I am wondering, therefore, if you would use your influence in securing an amendment to the appropriation bill granting this appropriation of \$15,000 to the Bureau of Entomology for this work on the Pacific coast in order that an equal amount will be provided for



work in our section. It is my understanding that a large portion of this money would be spent in eastern North Carolina and southeastern Virginia.

Any assistance that you can render in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

WM. A. GRAHAM,  
*Commissioner of Agriculture.*

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KINCHELOE: Page 62, line 5, after the word "cotton," insert a comma and the word "tobacco."

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up any time of the committee if the chairman of the subcommittee will agree to this amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, and seeds, and other agricultural products, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, \$1,227,000.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARE: Page 63, line 5, after the word "products," strike out "\$1,227,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,227,000."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, on last Saturday I gave notice to the House that at this time I would introduce the amendment just read asking to increase the appropriation for the market news service from \$1,227,000 to \$2,227,000. I assume that the Members of the House are quite familiar with this service.

We understand that the market news service was created in the Department of Agriculture a few years ago with the idea of furnishing producers information with reference to the demand and supply of particular crops in particular markets on any particular day of the year. This news service is of special importance to farmers who are engaged in growing fruits and perishable farm crops. For instance, a farmer has a perishable crop that he is ready to place on the market to-day; he has no information whatever as to the market to which this produce should be directed so that it would bring the highest possible price. But if he were advised by the Department of Agriculture, we will say every afternoon or evening at 6 o'clock, that in the great consuming centers of the country there is only a certain amount or a certain quantity of the crop in which he is interested, he would be able to know just where to consign his shipment. In other words, if a producer of watermelons or cantaloupes should know at the setting of the sun to-day the quantity of cantaloupes or watermelons in the various consuming centers he would know exactly where to consign his shipments.

This has proven to be a very valuable service, but on account of the limited appropriations the Department of Agriculture has not been able to render the service except in cases where the producers furnish the money to supply them with the information, whereas, gentlemen, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, as I pointed out a few days ago, is charged with the responsibility of securing and locating markets for the products of manufacturers.

This last year it was instrumental in increasing the sales of manufactured goods to the extent of \$45,000,000 or more, and yet the manufacturers were not called upon to pay anything for this service. The manufacturer and the purchaser were brought together by this governmental agency with no cost to either, and yet when the great producers of agriculture call upon the Government to furnish them with the same information or with corresponding information the Government has to come back and say, "We have it but we can not furnish it unless you put up the money to pay the cost of it."

This amendment provides that the appropriation shall be increased in a sufficient amount to bear the expense. Permit me to say that the Department of Agriculture, according to my

understanding, recommended to the Bureau of the Budget this last year, or before this appropriation bill was framed, that this appropriation be increased \$796,000. The Department of Agriculture, the governmental representative of the farmers, we might say, asked for this increase, but the Bureau of the Budget did not grant it, for it is my understanding that the department represented to the Bureau of the Budget that it would take the amount suggested to give prompt and efficient market news to all sections of the country.

I pointed out in a speech here last Saturday that the justification for this appropriation is that the Government is already providing similar service for the manufacturers of this country through the agency and efforts of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and, according to the report of the director, the bureau last year through its representatives increased the sales of 25 manufacturers approximately \$7,500,000, or an average of about \$298,000 each. We want by this amendment to provide a corresponding service for agriculture; and in this connection I desire to call attention to a statement made by President-elect Hoover in a speech he made in St. Louis on November 2. When speaking of farm-relief legislation, he said:

I believe we can apply to agriculture the principles and activities in this direction which we have applied to commerce and industry during the last seven and a half years. I believe we can solve a very large number of the problems of agricultural distribution and marketing through such methods.

There is no doubt, gentlemen, but what the bureau referred to has done wonderful things in assisting manufacturers in marketing and disposing of their products at a profit, and I contend that in all fairness and justice to the farmer and to agriculture this amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of agitation for an increase in the market news service. The minute we take over the market news service and have the Government pay for the whole of it you are going to increase the appropriations to where it will be beyond all bounds. There is just as much cooperation in the expansion of the news service so far as industry is concerned as there is agricultural. There is a great deal of cooperation, in fact all the big concerns in the foreign trade have their own representatives as well as representatives of the Government helping to extend trade in these areas.

The market news service is more or less new, but it has developed very fast. The thing that this House ought to remember is that in many items it is not money that will do the business; it is experience.

As a matter of fact, this department is expanding as fast as it ought to expand, because the minute you say that you ought to have established a new station you are not getting the value of the money expended.

Now, this map shows the big stations maintained solely at the Government expense. Growing out of this there are branches to small stations. There has been a demand made here that the Government should take over the total expense of the small stations and relieve all these various substations from any contribution whatever and maintenance of the new service. As a matter of fact, whenever you do that, if you establish that policy you are going to tremendously curtail the expansion of the news service, because I do not believe that you are going to get the department or the Budget or the President to continually come back here and make larger and increased appropriations for these items year after year at the sole expense of the Government.

As a matter of fact, the news-service station should be partially contributed to by those interested in the news service in the various localities. Here is what happens: They come and say we are willing to give the service an office, contribute so much, and we want the Government to be in command, and we will contribute so much locally and the Government contribute so much. In that way you establish a cooperative news station that is partially in charge of the local people and partially in charge of the Government. You have cooperation of the two. The minute you adopt this other program you are going to cripple the service.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. What did the department request?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. There is no statement in the hearing—

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. I understand that the department made a request for a larger sum and the Bureau of the Budget cut it down.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. It is not on record what the department did request.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HARE. The department asked for \$796,000 more than the Bureau of the Budget allowed.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. As a matter of fact, we have found that every department wants to increase its service faster than is justified. They make requests of the Budget a great deal larger than they should. I would like to know what official is giving out information of that kind.

I would like to know what official of the Bureau of the Budget is giving it out.

Mr. HARE. No one volunteered information to me. It was given to me because I asked for it.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I would like to know what official is giving out to Members of Congress promiscuous information of this kind outside of the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HARE. As I understand, the department does not give out the information promiscuously, but my information was obtained upon my personal request.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I suggest to the Members of the House that you will find in the hearings a criticism by me with reference to the secrecy of department estimates. I believe those estimates ought to be printed in the Budget hearings. I believe they ought to be public property, and I have so stated in the hearings. I also believe that if they were public property you would find that the department heads in some of the departments of this Government would not be making the extravagant requests that they are making now, knowing that they are not going to get them, because the amount they could possibly get under the appropriation, under the Budget system, could not reach such an amount. I am opposed to the department heads coming in here and making extravagant requests to the Budget upon the theory that they may work out some little amount of increase in their respective departments, and we found all along the line where we found the amount certified by those departments, that many of the requests are in excess of what they know the Budget will authorize. For that reason, if they were made public and printed, they would be careful as to how big a request they made to the President and to the Budget for their respective departments.

Mr. O'CONNELL. And the gentleman is contending this morning that the department makes statements to Members that are different from the statements made before the committee?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I am not contending any such thing.

Mr. O'CONNELL. That is what I understood.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I did not mean any such thing.

Mr. O'CONNELL. If the gentleman would clarify it, I would be grateful.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I say that they are not supposed to have the department estimates made public. I asked the gentleman where he got his information. We did not have any information from this department that they were not getting enough money to carry on this news service. We did not ask for their estimates, although we had that privilege.

Mr. BYRNS. Of course, the gentleman understands that the reason for that is the Executive order which forbids any executive department from asking any more than the Budget approves.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Is it not a fact that this is a considerable increase over last year's appropriation in any event?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. It is an increase of \$150,000, as I make it, and that is a 12 per cent increase, which seemed to me to be sufficient.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. The increase in the bill this year over last is an apparent increase of \$150,645; \$51,823 of that is required under the Welch Act, so that there is \$90,822 of increase in this item. With a service of this kind, if you make them drunk with money, you hurt the service rather than help it.

Mr. HARE. As I understand it, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce which does a similar work for industry has an appropriation of approximately \$3,000,000. Does the gentleman think that the Government should show any partiality or discrimination in making its appropriations in favor of industry in finding markets as against the service that it is willing to render to agriculture?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Oh, I do not think that you can compare a foreign service of that nature with the kind of service that we are discussing here.

Mr. HARE. But we can compare the principle involved.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Oh, no; you can not.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I can see that there may be necessity of forbidding officials of departments coming to Members of Congress and trying to override the action of the Bureau of the Budget, but I am unable to understand why the doors are closed entirely to Members of Congress and committees so that they can not find out even what a department asks the Bureau of the Budget to recommend.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. That information can be obtained as I understand it, in all public hearings, and I understand now that it is being given out to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] by both the department officials and the Budget officials.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. But the gentleman from Iowa now inveighs against that, and says that it is improper and should not be done.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. It is improper according to the order mentioned by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS. It is improper, as I understand the Executive order, for any Government official to appear before the committee and urge or ask an increase of their estimates over the amount allowed by the Budget; but I wish to say that, in so far as the Subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations are concerned—and I speak particularly with reference to those of which I am a member—we never have any trouble in getting the facts when we ask for them as to how much the department originally asked; but they never volunteer the information.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. But the gentleman from Tennessee knows that when a Member on the floor asks members of the Committee on Appropriations for that information, it is denied him.

Mr. BYRNS. I think the gentleman is mistaken as to that. It may be that in the course of the hearing that information was not asked for and obtained, but I do not think any member of the committee has ever denied that information, nor do I think that any Member of Congress should be denied that information when he goes either to the department or to the Budget. It is a public matter, and every Member of Congress is entitled to it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. But the only opportunity a Member of Congress has, or many of them, is to make inquiry of a member of the Committee on Appropriations when he is presenting the matter on the floor. Why a part of the information should be withheld I do not understand.

Mr. BYRNS. I want to reiterate what I said to the gentleman from Michigan a moment ago. I do not think that any chairman of a subcommittee or any member of the Committee on Appropriations has ever refused or would hesitate for a moment to give such information.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. All of the information that members of the committee have is in the hearings, and the minute those hearings are printed they are made available to all Members.

After an estimate is passed before our committee it is printed because we never ask anything for record as to estimates outside of a departmental hearing.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman knows that an official of the department appearing before a committee of Congress is not permitted to tell what he asked the Budget for.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. He is if you ask the question.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There are some estimates required to be kept secret, I do not know just exactly—

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. There is no question in my judgment it would be a wholesome thing if these estimates were made public.

Mr. BURTNESS. Members of the Appropriations Committee in this respect are in a different position than the other Members.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Not according to the statement of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BURTNESS. I understood the gentleman from Michigan to ask the question, or to raise the question, that you could not ask the direct question of the department heads.



Mr. McMILLAN. Can not any other Member of Congress who might desire raise the same question of the heads of a department?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. That is according to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BURTNESS. It would perhaps be quite right for the subcommittee to simply ask as the item was read what was the estimate made in the department.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Well, now, I would like to make a little speech.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Are the department estimates submitted to your committee?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. No, sir.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. With respect to some questions asked on the other side of the aisle, the subcommittee I serve on usually inserts in the record not only the Budget recommendation but also the estimates made by the departments to the Budget. If you will examine the hearings for the Departments of Justice, State, Labor, and Commerce, which will be available to-morrow, you will find much information of that character in the hearings.

Mr. BURTNESS. That very point was in my mind in the question, so that Members of Congress who desired information could look at the hearings.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I want to get this before the House if I can. There are increases authorized by the Budget of \$150,645. There are \$51,823 for the Welch Act. There is a \$24,400 increase in the survey of livestock and meats. Now, that survey is an important thing. Now, we increased a new service on fruits and vegetables in the amount of \$41,464. It was a service very well worth taking care of, and it is a service the department wants to increase as fast as they can. Fifteen thousand two hundred and forty dollars is for poultry and eggs. Now, that has become a big item in the merchandise of this country, and we are increasing that. There is \$17,718 carried for the service of grain, feed, and hay.

This map shows you where the large stations are, and you will see that they reach out to practically all the great producing areas of every section of the country as well as to the great consuming areas. You will notice the chain runs through most of the Mississippi Valley, on account of the vast production there; and that being the case, and taking into consideration the fact that it reaches out to the Pacific coast and down to the Gulf and over into the States of Florida and Alabama, it means that we are trying to expand this service to practically every area in the country.

Now, I do not believe that this House would be justified in increasing the amount in the bill and making an effort to double or treble the service under the existing conditions, because of the fact that we are now expending it, in my judgment, economically so far as we can do it. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, ordinarily in these items of appropriation I am content to accept the judgment of the members of the committee who prepared them. But occasionally items will arise of such importance, particularly to some industry of the country, that I think we are occasionally justified in overriding the decisions of the committee with reference to the amounts recommended to be appropriated, and I regard the item covered by the amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] as coming within the exception I have stated.

I represent an almost exclusively agricultural district. It is a district where our people for generations have been confining their agricultural activities largely to one cash crop, and for years and years the agricultural leaders have told us, and also the Department of Agriculture in Washington and the extension agents, that we should implore the farmers of Alabama to get away from the 1-crop system and diversify their agriculture.

My attention to the necessity of the new system along the line carried by this paragraph in the bill has been called particularly by the efforts of a local association in my home county, the Fruit and Vegetable Growers' Association. A number of our farmers went into the enterprise last year and devoted a great deal of preliminary expense to preparing the land and securing fertilizers and planting the crops, and they had splendid yields of their truck crops. But this past summer, when the time came for these men to market their products and they began to make inquiries as to what sections of the country afforded the best facilities for marketing, they could not find them because the officials of the department here, as the gentleman from South Carolina has pointed out, which has been clothed with authority to supply such information, say they have not sufficient funds to cover those sections to furnish it to the producers, the men gambling on their time and toll and money to produce their crops.

This inability to procure adequate information either from State or Federal authorities as to where the best markets could be had, where they could sell at a profit, presents to my mind a very practical proposition. I think by the enlargement of this appropriation the thousands and tens of thousands of farmers all over my section of the country who are undertaking to diversify their products and have money coming into their hands at certain seasons of the year, instead of one harvesting and marketing period, will be encouraged. I believe that this additional appropriation, as pointed out by the gentleman from South Carolina, is abundantly justified. The department having the administration of this fund say they need a larger sum for the effective prosecution of this work.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, last year Senator McNARY, in the hearings on the bill, asked that we provide for a complete survey, a complete job, in every part of the country. The department made that survey, and they made an estimate based on that survey, and that is where you get the \$700,000 suggested by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]. That being the case, it is an effort on the part of the gentleman from South Carolina not only to inaugurate the complete service of the entire country all in one lump, but to increase that by something like \$200,000.

Mr. HARE. I asked the gentleman from Iowa to agree to an amount equivalent to that suggested by the Budget.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I just want to add this one word: We have been talking about farm relief in Congress for a number of years past. It is still a matter of active interest and it is still undecided. It is possible that at the extra session of Congress a compromise farm relief bill of some sort will be enacted, and I have no doubt that that bill, if enacted, will carry an appropriation for a revolving fund of a very large figure. I understand that \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000 has been suggested as a proper amount to be turned over to the farm board to facilitate the profitable marketing of farm products. I have no doubt that the bill to be reported will carry an appropriation to that extent but my knowledge of this situation, with the limited opportunity I have had to give the subject careful study, leads me to believe that if you will transfer from that \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000 at least a million dollars to supply facilities to actual producers to obtain a direct and immediate market for their products you will do more for farm relief in a substantial way, especially for the benefit of the producers of fruits and vegetables, than you would do by adding this entire amount to the farm relief bill. Therefore I sincerely trust that the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina will be adopted.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I take advantage of the opportunity afforded in order that I may present to the House my ideas as to the logic of the position of the gentleman from Iowa regarding the duty of the Chief of the Budget. I do not concede infallibility of the Budget. Of course, we all understand that the Bureau of the Budget is not engaged in the administration of the various departments but we know that the bureau simply has information as to what the economy program of the administration is and, therefore, undertakes in a general way to allot the amounts that the administration thinks should be expended by the various governmental departments.

The Bureau of the Budget, as a matter of course from the nature of the circumstances, knows little or nothing as to the actual needs of the Agricultural Department, of the Military Department, or of any other department except as the head of the bureau obtains information from those departments as to their needs and desires. When it becomes necessary for the Bureau of the Budget to ascertain the needs of the Agricultural Department, the chief must go to the Agricultural heads for such information. For one, I believe that the information which is given to the Bureau of the Budget ought also to be available to Congress, in order that each Member of the Congress may understand what the desires and the necessities of the Agricultural Department are, just as well as the Bureau of the Budget understand them. Of course, I can understand why it may not be desirable to the Chief of the Bureau of the Budget to set aside an amount for the use of the Department of Agriculture, or any other department, and then have some man who is at the head of such department say that the amount allotted to department is not sufficient to meet its actual requirements and demands.

That is no doubt the reason for the Executive order. But, nevertheless, this is information that ought to be available to the Members of Congress. Congress, in the last analysis, has the responsibility of meeting the demands of the country. That responsibility rests upon the Members of Congress and not upon the Bureau of the Budget. We should meet that responsibility ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlemen from Georgia has expired.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes; certainly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does not the gentleman know, as a matter of fact, that if you undertake to get information from any head of a department they hesitate to give it to you because they are afraid of the Damocles sword that is kept over their heads by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes; I presume that condition exists in all the departments. As the gentleman has asked me the question I will state what my experience has been. I have in mind one case in which I looked up the matter myself. It was regarding an estimate or request for appropriation made of the Bureau of the Budget by the Post Office Department. I found that such information was in that instance contained in the hearings that were held before the subcommittee dealing with the Post Office appropriation bill and it was therefore available to all the Members. I think it ought always to be available to the Members and ought to be contained in the records.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN. As I understand it, under the present practice we legislate here as the result of the recommendations, to a great extent, of the Budget and not of the departments?

Mr. LARSEN. Exactly so.

Mr. McMILLAN. And in legislating we are the representatives of the people of the country and not of the Budget Bureau?

Mr. LARSEN. That is true. The difficulty is that we may fail to know the amounts which the heads of the departments think necessary to properly administer the departments over which they preside; we simply may have information as to what the Bureau of the Budget has decided to allot to the various departments rather than what amount should be allotted. As I understand, we may legislate in accordance with the Executive idea of economy rather than in accordance with necessities. I think that is a very regrettable condition and that we ought to correct it. It can be corrected if the members of the Appropriations Committee, who are dealing with these matters, will be diligent and see that the information is always obtained and embodied in the hearings. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The question has been raised here as to whether or not in matters of this kind all information is available to Members of Congress. I believe it should be. I believe at the same time that it is not available under the present way of doing business. If there is any fault with our comparatively new method of making appropriations, having all bills come from one committee instead of from a number of them, as was formerly the case, it is that very few Members, usually only three of them, have or are permitted to have full and intimate knowledge of the important matters which go into a bill. Other Members, all the rest of them, have difficulty in getting information. Obstacles are actually deliberately placed in the way of their getting information which, I think, everybody will agree they are entitled to have.

Now, I presume the idea is that if Members of Congress get full information, learn, for example, what heads of bureaus and departments wish, some of which has been denied by the bureau, the Congress will be inclined to extravagance. What is the history during the years the Bureau of the Budget has functioned and since the adoption of the rule of the House providing for preparation and presentation of appropriation bills by one committee alone?

It is within the right of the House and the Senate and the two bodies acting together on the receipt of a bill from a committee to change the amounts, put them up or put them down, as the judgment of the Congress dictates, and early in the history of the Bureau of the Budget and the system we now have in the House, whenever the House makes a material increase in an appropriation recommended by the Budget Bureau and presented to the House in a bill, there is an outcry over the country to the effect that the House is reckless and extravagant, is disregarding the recommendations of the Budget, is out of sympathy with the President's policy of economy. It is true that the Congress makes many changes, increases many appropriations, but at the same time it reduces many others, with the result that when the sessions of Congress close, when the record of each year by itself in full is made up, it is found

that the Congress has appropriated less money than was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and by the President himself; and these reductions made by the Congress have not been small or insignificant. During the years of the life of the Budget system appropriations have been more than \$368,000,000 less than the recommendations by the bureau and the President. The Congress, particularly the House, during each and all of the last eight years, has been the most economical part of the entire Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

As a member of the subcommittee, gentlemen, I feel it is my duty to state to the House the action of the subcommittee, what caused its action, the estimate of the Secretary of Agriculture to the Bureau of the Budget, and what caused this estimate.

All this talk we have had about a member of the Committee on Appropriations not being willing to state the amount the Secretary estimated to the Budget is all foolishness. There is no member of the Appropriations Committee who ever refused such information if he knew it; and if he did not know it, of course, he could not give it. So far as I am concerned, if Members of the House will read the hearings they will find in the hearings that, as far as my convictions and opinions are concerned, I do not think there is a single activity of the Federal Government outside of our foreign relations that every Member of Congress and every citizen of the United States ought not to have information about. This lies at the very foundation of a republican form of government, that its citizens shall know what the Government is doing and its every act that affects their interests. [Applause.] This is in the hearings on this bill.

I do not believe the estimates of any department should be kept secret at all. I do not believe the action of the Budget should be kept secret or that there should be any secrecy whatever in connection with the fiscal affairs of the Government, or anything else, for that matter.

Now, as to this item, Senator McNARY and Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa—in fact, the two subcommittees of the two Houses—have long felt that there should be a regular, orderly, systematic plan adopted by the Congress to govern market news service. In other words, the United States should be divided into zones, taking into consideration the relationship of production and consumption of specified commodities, and segregating them into appropriate production and consumption zones, and central stations should be established in each zone and to each of these central stations should be sent all the required information.

The Federal Government should maintain at its own cost the central stations where it collects all the information. Then the Federal Government should define a policy of whether or not, when they send this information out to local communities, local towns, or to different States, it should bear all the expenses or whether they should require a certain percentage of this extra expense to be contributed by the States, municipalities, or other organizations.

We should adopt a general policy and treat every section alike and not have the slipshod method that now controls the conduct of this fund.

In obedience to this idea Senator McNARY requested the Secretary of Agriculture to make an estimate to the Budget that would provide for a complete and efficient marketing service that would render service to every section and every locality where such service was demanded throughout the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In obedience to this recommendation for a complete service for the Union the Secretary of Agriculture recommended to the Budget an increase of \$796,000. If it had not been for this request of Senator McNARY, the Secretary of Agriculture would have asked a normal increase—about what the Budget approved and about what this committee gave. This recommendation was based upon, called for, and responded to only by reason of this request as to how much it would take for a complete service throughout the Union. So that this amendment, which was introduced by my friend from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], provides over \$200,000 more than is necessary for a complete service throughout the Union.



Now, let us look into this estimate. I think we treated this service fairly.

This committee gave an increase over the last appropriation of \$98,822. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] read you the allocation of that increase. Granting an increase as provided in the amendment when the committee has under consideration the formulation and adoption of a complete plan governing the service throughout the Nation is inadvisable and bad business—I do not think it is business, I do not think the money would be economically expended. It would provide for too great an expansion in one year.

Now as to the present system, I hold in my hand a statement from the Agricultural Department where 34 little towns and cities have asked for this service. The reply was that they must contribute something towards this service and these towns have contributed all the way from \$100 to \$1,500—one town having paid \$100 for the service and another town having paid \$1,500 for the service with absolutely no rule to govern the equity or charges imposed upon the two sections. That is not right, that is not equality, that is not justice to all sections of this country at the hands of this department.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN. Can the gentleman inform us whether or not in the administration of this fund due consideration has been given to farm products as compared with industry—manufacturing concerns?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The fund has been administered by the Department of Agriculture solely in the interest of agriculture. The only reason it has business with manufacturing concerns is because there is where a great part of the consumption comes from, and from those concerns and industrial centers we must gather the information on consumption of farm products to furnish to the farmers.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will my friend yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Surely.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. My friend just stated that there was a recommendation to increase the appropriation \$796,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; for a complete service throughout the United States.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think that if that appropriation were made the Agricultural Department could be trusted to spend it properly and afford to agriculture generally a relief by extending the market service?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That may accord with the gentleman's idea, but in my experience as a member of the committee, when a department gets an appropriation for an amount of money like that there should be regulations and limitations as to the expenditures.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The difficulty is we have no method of regulation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. There seems to be a very urgent necessity found in many sections of the country for the expansion of this service. We have in my own State a great anxiety for the extension of the service, and the only way we can get any form of extension and in that way some measure of agricultural relief is to have an increased appropriation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Personally I think the urgency of this matter is mostly a matter of imagination.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I do not think so if I may say so; the President the other day pointed out the difficulty found by the potato producers. I know of an important Virginia association engaged in the production of that one crop and it has trouble in securing information, and probably can not get it unless the Department of Agriculture is provided with the opportunity to furnish it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does my friend realize that from every central station that information is daily sent out over the earth through more than 100 broadcasting stations, and that a telegram to that station will bring the information desired? It is the idea of some Members that this information is locked up in the bureau and can not be obtained. There is not a word of truth in that. All information and any information at the request of any citizen anywhere will be promptly furnished. It is furnished to the press and is being carried throughout the United States. It is even mimeographed and sent wherever needed.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If my friend will yield further, the logic of that statement would seem to be that you might properly reduce the present appropriation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That very position was taken by my friend from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and by myself and by other Members of this House years ago. This appropriation has increased by leaps and bounds since it was inaugurated, and I tell you that any place that has interest enough to want a local office and local news ought to be required to contribute a small amount to demonstrate that interest and necessity. Therefore I advocate central stations, from which this news could be disseminated under cooperative agreements to every section whenever and wherever demanded.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN. Would you say that that ought also to be true of the Bureau of Domestic and Foreign Commerce with regard to the manufacturing interests of the country? That information is disseminated through that bureau free of charge, without cost to anyone making inquiries.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, I am not going to get off on a discussion of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Mr. McMILLAN. I mention that because that is the bureau that undertakes to disseminate information in line with this to the manufacturing interests of the country.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What does the gentleman mean—publishing trade opportunities in foreign countries? That has no application whatever to this.

Mr. McMILLAN. In the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce they publish trade opportunities for people at home to secure business.

Mr. BUCHANAN. To secure business in foreign countries.

Mr. McMILLAN. And at home.

Mr. BUCHANAN. They merely publish these opportunities. The Agricultural Department publishes everything that it has, and more.

Mr. McMILLAN. Our people here at home do not pay for that service that they receive.

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; neither do the farmers pay for the service of publication in the newspapers or for literature, or for news sent out over the radio by the Department of Agriculture. I undertake to tell you that the Agriculture Department gives more complete free information to the producers of this country than the Department of Commerce does to the manufacturing interests.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. We have in our State of Florida a State marketing bureau. I am wondering if the gentleman knows whether there is a provision in this bill for cooperation with that marketing bureau.

Mr. BUCHANAN. At what place?

Mr. GREEN. Jacksonville.

Mr. BUCHANAN. There is a place at Orlando, Fla., and at Belle, Fla., and at Sanford, Fla.

Mr. GREEN. Our State marketing headquarters is in Jacksonville.

Mr. BUCHANAN. They can get complete information.

Mr. GREEN. Can it be obtained without expense to our State?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would not say so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to make this observation, that the estimate of the department was for a complete survey, that if you appropriated the full amount of money asked for it could not be inaugurated in any single year. In view of the fact that we have increased this amount for this service every year, it seems to me that the committee is proceeding with its expansion as fast as good judgment dictates it should be expended. As a matter of fact, all of the money that you want to appropriate is not going to give you the service. What you must have is experience and to work out the system as good judgment dictates. I think the committee has met the demand for an increase in this service when it put in here the amount of the Budget of approximately \$100,000. I ask for a vote.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by the substitute which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment by a substitute which he sends to the desk, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARE: Page 63, in line 5, after the word "products" strike out the figures "\$1,227,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$2,023,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of stating that this substitute is offered for the purpose of conforming to what the chairman said the department said in its investigation would be a sufficient amount to give complete market news to the entire country.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. And the gentleman admits that that would be inaugurating the service all in one year, without gradual development or expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARE) there were—ayes 48, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 61 for the purpose of moving to strike out the proviso beginning on line 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to return to page 61 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 61, beginning in line 16, strike out the proviso, ending in line 19.

Mr. JONES. I do not think there is any objection to the amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. There is no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, salaries and expenses, \$4,662,933.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will take five minutes. I desire to call to the attention of the House that a few days ago there was considerable discussion on this floor concerning the plan of apportionment which would exclude aliens from the total count of the population as a basis for apportionment. At this time I merely want to read into the Record a letter which appears to substantiate some of the statements I made the other day. At a later date I will present some important facts bearing on the matter. This letter, which was sent to all Members of the House and Senate, was from William H. Anderson, general secretary American Protestant Alliance, reads as follows:

AMERICAN PROTESTANT ALLIANCE,  
New York City, December 18, 1928.

To the Members of the Senate and House:

It was charged last Saturday on the floor of the House that a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide for the exclusion of aliens from the total count of the population as a basis for the apportionment of congressional districts, the precedent for which is found in the New York State constitution, was inspired by the Anti-Saloon League and the Klan.

If it were a mere question of credit, time could settle it, since the record is conclusive. But when an attempt is made to obscure the merits of such a fair and vital proposal by raising false issues, establishment of its origin becomes vital to the cause.

I originated this proposal, and am not and never have been a member of the Klan. It was first proposed nearly 10 years ago. I included it in a dry enforcement manual written, published, and copyrighted by me in 1921. It was actually introduced in the House at my request by Mr. STALKER a year ago, on December 15, 1927, as H. J. Res. 102. The Klan has never indorsed it, though, so far as I know, klansmen individually generally approve it.

This disposes of the charge of Klan origin. The charge respecting the Anti-Saloon League is partly true, in that I was superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of New York when I first made and published this proposal. While the Anti-Saloon League has never formally indorsed it, its national president and national superintendent have approved it from the prohibition angle. Undoubtedly the constituency of the dry organizations will approve it as a matter of fundamental justice. Why should citizens of the United States in the larger cities (merely because they are entirely surrounded by aliens) have more

proportionate representation in Congress than an equal number of citizens living where there are no aliens?

This proposal raises no religious issue. The American Protestant Alliance, which is behind it, makes no attack upon any system of worship or the religious faith or belief of any person. While it is being pushed on its merits as a strictly American proposal, I admit it will put a terrible crimp in Tammany and the Tammany sort of wet political organizations and the wet and alien forces behind Tammany.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM H. ANDERSON,  
General Secretary American Protestant Alliance.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. I will.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Does not the gentleman think that he should reserve that letter for insertion in the Record as a public document until the new administration comes in? These fellows are not responsible for this administration, but are for the next administration.

Mr. SCHAFER. The facts do not substantiate the gentleman's contention.

If he will carefully scan the returns of the last election, he will find that nearly all of the States carried by Governor Smith are strongholds of the Ku-Klux Klan and dry forces.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### COMPLETION OF WOOL WORK

To enable the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to complete the work of the domestic wool section of the War Industries Board and to enforce Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918 as established by the wool division of said board, pursuant to the Executive order dated December 31, 1918, transferring such work to the said bureau, \$8,000, and to continue, as far as practicable, the distribution among the growers of the wool clip of 1918 of all sums heretofore or hereafter collected or recovered with or without suit by the Government from all persons, firms, or corporations which handled any part of the wool clip of 1918.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. This appropriation has been carried for a great number of years. I have had something to say in regard to it for a number of years past each year, and each time I have gained the impression that the work was going to be completed, and it would not be carried in a future bill, but I note that every year it comes along with exactly the same language, to complete the work, and \$8,000 is provided. I understand there are two or three employees in the Department of Agriculture to carry on this supposed work. Now, this work has gotten to a point where I can not understand why it is necessary to keep one or two employees, at a good salary, and probably a clerk or secretary, on the rolls while these suits are pending; and the charge has been made, and made deliberately in this House and on the outside, that these suits have been deliberately held up, and those in charge of the work there have not been pressing them as they should be, and that, as a matter of fact, if it were not for their delay they would have been settled long ago. In fact, the issue could and would have been settled long ago had not the Government, acting, no doubt, on the advice of these very employees, abandoned an appeal from an adverse decision in one of the inferior Federal courts.

It seems to me there ought to be a conclusion. If it is necessary to look after the suits that are pending, the cases should be turned over to the Department of Justice. Why continue this appropriation merely to keep somebody in a job year after year?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. On page 503 of the hearings you will find the following statement showing the present status of this work:

	Number of dealers	Excess profits
Total ascertained 1918 excess wool profits.....	1,058	\$1,511,552.03
Excess profits—		
Collected.....	1,002	760,702.91
Distributed to growers.....		453,609.36
Held because paid under protest.....		48,887.38
Undistributable (can not locate growers).....		249,310.39
Uncollectible (included in above total ascertained), due to insolvency of dealers or adverse court decisions not determinative of the facts.....	28	70,623.98
Yet to be collected.....	28	680,225.14
Cases pending with Department of Justice.....	30	654,581.72
Cases pending with Department of Agriculture.....	8	25,643.42



Those are cases pending in the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Justice at this date. On the next page, page 504, you will find this statement:

The present appropriation item of \$8,000 is to cover salaries, travel, and other expenses incident to the trial of pending cases and the incidental audit of new cases which may be received. The entire salary of an accountant and auditor, amounting to \$3,200, is carried in this appropriation, as he has been engaged on this work for a number of years, has audited the cases still pending, and his testimony is absolutely essential in connection with the trial of pending cases. The only other salary now carried under this appropriation is that of one stenographer and general clerk (\$1,800) who is familiar with the details of this work, and devotes part of her time to other work.

Now, we had this question up at the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee as to whether or not we could abandon this item. This man, when you come to the trial of the case, is necessary. He would aid in presenting the data gathered on the part of the Government. I do not think, if we struck out this item and the man were lost, that you could successfully prosecute these cases. One case went to the Supreme Court and was dismissed. The department insists that it simply involves the merits of this controversy. They want to have a case tried on its merits and taken to a higher court.

Mr. BYRNS. If the gentleman will pardon me, that is the same explanation that I received a year ago and two years ago. Of course, the gentleman is giving the explanation that has been given to him by this employee engaged in the so-called work, but that is the excuse that has been given for the past four or five years to my knowledge. Why is it that it takes seven or eight years to have this work concluded and to put that test case through the Federal courts? Without regard to what has been suggested by those interested in one section or another of the country, it leads to the suspicion that there has been no real, genuine effort on the part of those in charge of this work to conclude it, for the reason that when it is concluded, their salaries will cease.

I do not subscribe to the gentleman's idea, that simply because the testimony that could be given by this accountant down there would be valuable to the Government, we ought to keep him on the roll year after year at \$3,200. If he is a citizen of the country and has evidence or information of value to the Government, in the first place he ought to be willing to give it, since he secured it while employed by the Government. If he is not willing, then we have laws to compel him to give testimony as to the facts.

This matter ought to be concluded. I do not know for sure whether it was the gentleman from Iowa or his predecessor, who was then in control of this bill, who gave me the assurance, as I understood it, that in another year this matter would be cleared up. I have no assurance now that in the next year's bill this appropriation will not still be carried.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I have not given such an assurance, but it is my impression that the department, through one of its officials, did make such a statement, depending upon the issue of a former case decided by the Supreme Court, not on the merits of the case itself.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman employed down there is an accountant, not an attorney. These cases, of course, that are pending are in the charge of the United States district attorneys in the various districts where the suits have been brought. They are under the Department of Justice. The United States district attorney, of course, gets a salary. Why is it necessary to keep an accountant down in the Department of Agriculture to try a simple suit in the Supreme Court? Why not let the Department of Justice handle these cases?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. The detective gets the evidence, and oftentimes the evidence of the detective has more to do with the winning of a lawsuit than anything else.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes. This man has been in the Agricultural Department for eight years, and the Department of Justice has the power to bring him into court and compel him to tell the court or jury the facts. If we are going to have this man on the salary roll all these years, incurring all this expense, there will not be anything to recover when we get through. Besides the cases are to be tried on the law of the case. If evidence was needed it ought to have been taken long ago. The facts are that there is no justification for this appropriation. It should have been wound up long ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the control and prevention of spread of the European corn borer, \$898,000: *Provided*, That in addition thereto there shall be immediately available for this purpose \$50,000 of the \$10,000,000 appropriated by the

joint resolution making an appropriation for the eradication or control of the European corn borer, approved February 23, 1927 (U. S. C., Supp. I, p. 22, sec. 146).

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KETCHAM. I do this, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee to make a statement as to the status of the appropriation that was considered last year in connection with the authorization of \$7,000,000 adopted by the Congress in May of 1928 for corn-borer clean-up.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. That appropriation was made available, but there is no appropriation in this bill from that amount.

Mr. KETCHAM. Is the reason for that the fact that this bill covers the operations of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year beginning July 1 next; and consequently, if we are to have any immediate value out of any corn-borer clean-up appropriation it would have to come in a deficiency bill for the present year that would make available the funds in the coming spring? Is that correct?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. As a matter of fact, that \$7,000,000 was merely an authorization; an authorization, I think, for a year.

If there is any activity under that appropriation, it would have to come under authority of a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. KETCHAM. That is the reason it is not included in this bill?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes; and it would not be included in this bill under any circumstances. This bill merely carries \$898,000, which continues the quarantine and eradication work in order to prevent the corn borer from spreading. It carries absolutely nothing for clean-up work. It carries absolutely nothing for the purpose of enabling them to go on a man's farm and assist him in cleaning up his cornstalks. The attitude of the department, as I see it, is that their activities at the present time should be limited to two fields of investigation; first, research investigations, for which there is provided \$150,000 out of the old \$10,000,000 appropriation, and second, the quarantine work, which provides for quarantine and the stationing of men on public roads to prevent people from taking corn from an infested area into an uninfested area.

They further state that there has been no commercial damage outside of a very small area in the lake section. That being the case, the department's recommendations are only for the quarantine control work and for further research work along the lines suggested. One of the things I want to bring to the attention of the gentleman is that one of the best ways to eradicate the corn borer is by making paper out of cornstalks. I have here an issue of the *Prairie Farmer*, which is printed on paper made from cornstalks. The cornstalks were collected at Danville, Ill., some of them from the farm of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOLADAY]. It was made into pulp there; from there it was taken to Kalamazoo, Mich., and there put into paper, and this edition of the *Prairie Farmer* is printed on paper made out of cornstalks.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. If I have the floor, I will yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It was manufactured from cornstalks into paper in eight hours.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for that suggestion. If we are going to be able to use cornstalks for a matter of this kind we are going to have one of the best clean-up methods you could possibly have anywhere, because you will take the home of the corn borer and make it into paper rather than leave it in the field, where the corn borer can hibernate.

Mr. KETCHAM. Specifically I want to ask the gentleman whether or not under the present situation of this authorization the Committee on Appropriations can consider or has any idea of considering recommendations for a \$7,000,000 clean-up appropriation at this session of Congress?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. We have nothing before us, and we can only consider those things which come before us in the regular way.

Mr. KETCHAM. Do I understand that last year the usual procedure was taken and that the Department of Agriculture reported to the Budget and that the Budget, through the President, made a recommendation to your committee, and the appropriation was considered but it was not included in a deficiency bill because of the lack of time; is that correct?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KETCHAM. I would like to inquire whether it is the position of the Committee on Appropriations that a new recommendation must be made, and that the previous recommendation does not hold over from the first session of the Seventieth Congress to the second session but must be begun again? In other words, you will take no action on last spring's recommendation one way or the other unless a new recommendation comes through the regular channels, as though it had not been previously recommended?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I think that would be our position.

Mr. KETCHAM. I want to get this exactly correct. That is a correct statement of the committee's position?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. I am emphasizing this point because there are a number of States vitally interested in this appropriation, and I want to know exactly what the status of the matter is. I thank the gentleman for his response.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I understood the gentleman to say that his committee can consider nothing that does not come before it. I assume that means comes through the Budget. Is that correct?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Well, our recommendations as a committee, as I understand it, are based on Budget recommendations. We can consider an increase in an amount or a new item in a project. For instance, under plant industry we could go out anywhere and take on a new plant, but we could not put into an appropriation bill an entirely new item, which would be an absolutely new project, without some legislative authority.

Mr. SMITH. Unless it is estimated for?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Unless it is estimated for; yes.

Mr. SMITH. In other words, a matter brought to the attention of your committee by a Member of Congress, something relating to his district, can not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations unless it has been estimated for; is that correct?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Oh, no; unless it is authorized in some law that has been heretofore passed.

Mr. SMITH. Suppose it is for the increase of an appropriation?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. We can consider that.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I wish to take this opportunity of making some remarks upon the estimates for the Weather Bureau. In view of the fact that the bill was not available to the Members until the day upon which it was introduced and that the Weather Bureau section of the bill was read for amendment on the same day, I was not able to prepare the information at that time.

The Pacific Ocean is one of the largest bodies of water in the world and the water areas in the world are three-fourths of the whole world area. In this section, for the Weather Bureau, there is included an increase of appropriations of \$20,000 for marine observations in the field, all of which is to be expended in the Atlantic Ocean. None of it is for extension in the Pacific Ocean.

I have here a letter from the Director of the Weather Bureau in which he says, "Of course, the amount of money is quite inadequate to indicate current weather conditions in an area as large as the Pacific Ocean."

It is a fact that upon one of the sample charts that is issued by the Weather Bureau, the whole weather forecasts in that ocean are predicted, for example, on this particular chart of January 5, 1922, upon five ship observations, besides the shore observations.

When we are trying to increase our sea-borne commerce, we must provide accurate methods by which the weather may be known to the operators on the sea, and the marine part of the Weather Bureau service must be organized not only upon the Atlantic Ocean but in the Pacific Ocean as well.

The estimates that were given to me as necessary to start the work in the Pacific, and increase it at least appreciably, were \$5,000 and I would have submitted such an estimate upon page 16 of this bill had I had the opportunity of getting the information in proper time.

I simply now wish to call attention to the lack of information that is available in the Pacific Ocean for American and world commerce.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be authorized to correct the totals in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LUCE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 15386, the agricultural appropriation bill, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Upon motion of Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NORTHERN PACIFIC LAND GRANT

The SPEAKER. To fill a vacancy on the Joint Committee to Investigate the Northern Pacific Land Grant the Chair appoints the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LETTS].

#### COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 271

*Resolved*, That House Resolution 232, creating a special committee to investigate and report to the House on campaign expenditures, be, and the same is hereby, amended so that the functions of said committee and the time for making its report to the House are extended from January 1, 1929, to March 1, 1929.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this satisfactory to the minority?

Mr. SNELL. I was about to say that I have consulted the minority leader and some members of the committee, and it is perfectly satisfactory. The work they did was continued so late in the session that it is absolutely impossible for them to complete the report on the 1st of January, and we are extending the time to the 1st of March.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### RESOLUTION MAKING IN ORDER CERTAIN LEGISLATION

Mr. SNELL, from the Committee on Rules, presented a report of that committee on House Resolution 273, making in order certain legislation, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Would the gentleman from New York mind telling us what those bills are?

Mr. SNELL. Those are judges bills, one for the southern district of New York, one for the eastern district of New York, one for an additional judge for the second judicial circuit, and one for the southern district of Florida.

#### AMENDING CLAUSE 4 OF RULE XI

Mr. SNELL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a report on House Resolution 261, amending clause 4 of Rule XI of the rules of the House of Representatives, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### AMENDING RULE X

Mr. SNELL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a report on House Resolution 272, providing for the amending of Rule X for the appointment of committee on memorials, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.



## ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5773. An act to provide for the construction of works for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin, for the approval of the Colorado River compact, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14801. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 352. A joint resolution for the relief of Porto Rico. The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4302. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey the Federal Point Lighthouse Reservation, N. C., to the city of Wilmington, N. C., as a memorial to commemorate the battle of Fort Fisher; and

S. J. Res. 167. A joint resolution limiting the operation of sections 198 and 203 of title 18 of the Code of Laws of the United States.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5773. An act to provide for the construction of works for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin, for the approval of the Colorado River compact, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14801. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 352. A joint resolution for the relief of Porto Rico. APPROPRIATION BILL FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND FOR DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15569) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes; and pending that I will ask the gentleman from Alabama if we can agree on the time for general debate?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I have requests at the present time for about two hours.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to four hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15569, and pending that he asks unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to four hours, two hours to be controlled by himself and two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. SHREVE was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. LEAVITT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. May I ask the gentleman from Alabama if the gentleman from New York [Mr. SROVICH] may have time tomorrow, because he gracefully yielded the other day when he asked to have a fixed hour?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. In my estimate of time I had in mind an hour for the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN] 40 minutes.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: Among the great departments of our Government for which this bill makes appropriations is the Department of State. It is probable that at only one other time in the history of our country has the work of this department reached the proportions in which it is being handled to-day. That time was preceding our entry into and during the World War.

Some of the current problems in which new developments are noted almost daily are quite as important and contain elements of as far-reaching effect as some of the memorable notes exchanged with the European powers at that time.

## KELLOGG PACT

I refer particularly to the multiple treaty for the outlawing of war, now reported to another body for ratification. When the history of the world for the year 1928 shall come to be written there will be recorded beyond peradventure as its crowning achievement the signing by 15 nations on August 27 of the Briand-Kellogg pact for the renunciation of war as a means for the settlement of international differences.

That this accomplished fact is no mere gesture is readily grasped when it is recorded that a large number of other nations have joined the original signers, which group comprised with a single exception the principal nations of the world.

When it is said that the governments of the world, all but six, have expressed willingness to join in this crusade for the renunciation of force the impetus that has been given to the idea that peace on earth is devoutly wished for, is greatly strengthened and the attainment thereof becomes perceptibly nearer.

The frightful toll in human life that war exacts has permeated to the marrow of every government, producing the conviction that if so-called civilization is to long endure the thoughts of using barbaric methods must be eradicated from the catalogue of activities constituting national existence.

## PLANTING SEED

Planting the seed in the mind of nationals that armed conflict has no longer a part in the national formula for sustaining honor and dignity, the expectation bids fair of realization that as "great oaks from little acorns grow" we, too, may see our fondest hopes in this particular fulfilled.

A President of the United States once remarked that it did not make so much difference as to the length of the step as to the direction in which it was taken.

The right direction happily has been sensed as well as the step taken. True, police protection and insurance are still to be regarded as of great value. The Army and Navy are not to be abandoned, but if in the course of time, as the beneficence of the idea, that of renunciation, grows and becomes a fixed reality, a reduction of a part of six hundred and seventy millions annually in our present cost for maintenance might eventually be possible.

If the entire burden of armament throughout the world could be lifted, the sum of three billions annually, we are told by experts, could be otherwise expended. What a fund for the amelioration of mankind, in the eradication of slums, the building of improved highway construction, the creation of playgrounds for children, so that their bright young lives would have safe places in which to expend their youthful energy, and for other uplifting operations.

The ceremony at Paris was in complete harmony with the simplicity of the compact. Including the ambassadors and their staffs, not over 300 persons were present. The clock room of the foreign office would not hold any more. The American ambassador, Mr. Herrick, had only two score of tickets to satisfy the demand of the Americans.

## HIGHLY HONORED

To be one of those favored was the honor which was highly appreciated. The barrage of cameras and moving-picture machines was not only imposing, but it was formidable.

I counted over a score of installations for permanently recording this historic event. Hitherto I was somewhat familiar with the mechanical devices necessary for formal occasions similar to inaugurations and conventions. But this occasion surpassed them all in the multiplicity of the devices for the recording for posterity the momentous occasion. The event taking place in an interior, huge searchlights of a million candle power were ranged out of doors, their focus being trained on the table where the signatures were affixed, the object being to produce adequate light for the proper accomplishment of the work of the photographic operators. When the electricity was turned on, the heat generated was noticeable to a marked degree. This condition being foreseen, special fire-fighting apparatus stood ready for services. Fortunately its help was not needed.

## AMBASSADORS ENTER

When the ambassadorial procession approached the salon the invited guests, according to the usages of polite custom, arose in their places to pay due deference to the notables about to enter. This interfered with the photographic line of vision. Many insistent and prolonged cries of "be seated," "sit down," were violently ejaculated, thus marring the solemnity of the occasion. When Secretary Kellogg came to attach his signature

to the pact he was overcome with emotion, the evidences of which were plainly visible before he brushed them away.

That the United States should have contributed in such a marked degree to this epochal proceeding is most fitting, and the American people will hasten to give full credit to all who have had a part in this great achievement.

It would be impossible to overestimate the tact, the candor, the patience, and the unflagging industry of Secretary Kellogg in attaining this epochal achievement.

Surmounting every obstacle, he has reached a pinnacle of useful endeavor seldom if ever equaled.

#### LATIN-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Colonel Lindbergh's flight to the countries of Central America had great value in our relations with those countries. Quick to see the possibilities of improving our means of communications with them, arrangements are now practically complete to have each of those nations tied to the United States by means of daily mail-plane flights over established courses. These may easily be extended as required, so that it is well within the realm of possibilities to see in the not-distant future not only mail but passengers and freight transported by the same means. Sections now somewhat isolated and remote will become practically a part of our own land.

As we saw a few weeks ago when the *Graf Zeppelin* was here, we will undoubtedly see dirigibles carrying mail, passengers, and freight to the Latin-American and South American countries. I hold in my hand one of those letters, postmarked on the face of it October 28, 1928, on this side of the Atlantic, and on the back there is a receiving postmark of Friedericks-hafen, in Germany, of November 1—only three days in time being required for communications leaving America to reach the German Republic.

In this connection, I wonder how many of the membership of this House know that the postal laws have been so reorganized that it costs no more for an American to send a letter from Washington to any country in Central America or South America—with two exceptions, Dutch Guiana and French Guiana—for the same 2-cent stamp that you use in mailing a letter from here to the Treasury Department or to New York City? That shows that the United States is quite up to date as far as postal facilities are concerned.

There is no part of the world in which the United States has a deeper and more friendly interest than Latin America. Our relations with the Latin-American countries during the past year have been very satisfactory. During the year 1927 American trade with Latin America amounted to over \$2,000,000,000, or 40 per cent of the total foreign trade of Latin America. It is estimated that American investments in Latin America now reach more than \$5,000,000,000. During the year 1927 alone, the State Department informs us, \$335,000,000 worth of Latin American government obligations were purchased by citizens of the United States. There are in the Latin-American field 47 diplomatic and 149 consular officers of the United States.

One of the most important events in 1928 in connection therewith was the Sixth Pan American Conference at Habana. It seems needless to point to the results of that conference as they have been universally described as beneficial by the public press and by our delegates as well as by the President and the Secretary of State. The conference covered matters of an inter-American juridical nature, problems of inter-American communications, intellectual cooperation among the Americans, inter-American economic problems, and inter-American social problems, all of which are of vast importance to the United States.

Almost as though "coming events had cast their shadows before," a treaty division was established last spring in the Department of State. It is now possible to give specialized attention to the important questions of treaties between this country and other countries.

#### SEVEN HUNDRED TREATIES

The United States has some 700 treaties. Some of them are of a permanent character, such as treaties of peace and boundary. Others require revision from time to time to meet new conditions which may arise. Eighty-five of the treaties are commercial treaties or commercial agreements. A large number of this class no longer meet present requirements because conditions have changed since they were concluded. Of the 26 general commercial treaties to which the United States was a party at the close of the war, 19 were concluded prior to 1885 and 7 of these prior to 1850.

Anyone acquainted with the changes in trade relations, manufacturing competition, and in other directions must realize that these treaties must fall to meet present requirements. With some of the important countries, especially some of the new countries which came into existence as the result of the war settlements, the United States has no general commercial treaties.

The clauses embodied in the tariff law of 1922 have made it necessary to negotiate a new series of commercial treaties. The older commercial treaties were based generally on the conditional most-favored-nation principle. The unconditional most-favored-nation principle results necessarily from the tariff act of 1922. These new treaties have generally taken the form of treaties of friendship, commerce, and consular rights. Only eight such treaties have so far been concluded since 1922, those with Austria, Estonia, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Latvia, Norway, and Salvador.

There are many other classes of treaties urgently requiring attention, such as consular conventions, conventions on maritime law, conventions in regard to naturalization, extradition, arbitration, liquor smuggling, industrial property, and copyrights. Within the past year there have been proposed to foreign governments by the United States 32 treaties of arbitration and 15 of conciliation. Eleven treaties of arbitration have been signed, 7 treaties of conciliation, 3 of friendship, commerce, and consular rights, and 11 others.

#### OFFICE OF THE LEGAL ADVISER

One of the most interesting and important branches of the Department of State, and one concerning which more should be heard, is the office of the legal adviser. It is that office, headed by the solicitor, that gives legal advice to the Secretary of State and other offices of the department and which determines what shall be done with the many international claims filed against the United States or by the United States against foreign governments.

Through that office collections have also been made from various foreign governments of a number of claims during the past year ranging from \$500 to \$80,000 each, and correspondence with various foreign governments is now in progress for the collection of claims of numerous American citizens aggregating many millions of dollars. One of these claims amounts to \$13,000,000.

This office has been engaged recently in the preparation of approximately 450 claims filed by American citizens against Turkey and in correspondence with 750 prospective claimants preparatory to the discussion of claims with representatives of the Turkish Government. These claims aggregate some \$6,500,000.

The solicitor has defended the United States against a number of claims by foreign governments growing out of the alleged detention of ships and expropriation of property by the United States during the World War and out of alleged excessive taxation and default in obligations of the Government of the United States to former American Indians now in Canada. Two of these claims amount to more than \$3,000,000.

The solicitor's office distributed the awards in favor of 29 American claimants, made by the American-British Arbitral Tribunal, established pursuant to the convention of 1910, in the amount of approximately \$75,000. Some of the claims arose more than half a century ago and much difficulty was experienced in determining, in the light of assignments, bequests, and court decrees, who the rightful beneficiaries of the awards were.

This office handled several cases before the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, involving boundary waters between the two countries and conflicting interests of American and Canadian citizens arising along the boundary.

The office participated in the proceedings of the International Radio Conference held in Washington in 1927, and in the preparation for participation in the International Telegraph Conference held in Brussels from September 10 to 22, 1928. It has participated in the conferences on the revision of the navigation laws of the United States and in the preparation of numerous memoranda for the American delegates to other international conferences. In brief, the office of the solicitor advises not only the Secretary of State in matters of law but virtually every American delegation to an international conference and the American representatives on virtually all international commissions.

#### RATIOS

It is very popular at the present time to talk about ratios—especially in connection with naval affairs. For my own part I am not only willing but thoroughly indorse any proposition that is deemed essential to safeguard this country and protect its citizens and activities. Doubtless there are many that will agree with me. Why, then, should there not be such a ratio of helpfulness to the activities which furnish the foundation reason for there being a navy or an army?

As our commerce increases, the stimulus that fostered it, perhaps really instituted it, should not be attenuated or curtailed. The growth of commerce should be continually nurtured and watched, and the vision that only sees as far as the moment is not the kind that can prosper in the hectic rivalry that is the order of the day. The amounts expended for trade promotion are analogous to seed being planted in fertile soil which have



brought forth in many instances not only a hundred but a thousand fold. I heartily indorse the principle of economy, and whatever energy I had had or can exercise in the future will be directed to that end, but with the strong competitive conditions existing throughout the world it will not do to ignore opportunities as they come knocking at our doors. We must seize psychological opportunities.

Years of association with these hearings enables the committee to appreciate the intense and increasing interest that the Members of the House are manifesting in connection with trade expansion, for their constituents are pleasantly tasting to a limited degree the fruits of the progress that has been accomplished, and their appetite having been whetted, they are naturally demanding more.

#### FOREIGN TRADE PROMOTION

Now let us for a few moments consider the trade situation of the world to-day as it comes to us through the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

America's expenditures on her foreign trade promotion are not as large as those of our principal trade rivals. On a per capita basis our Canadian neighbors will spend nearly twice as much as we will during the present fiscal year. If the appropriations of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce were on the same basis as those of the Canadian Commercial Intelligence Service, the United States would spend \$8,196,888 instead of \$4,257,357.

On the basis of current appropriations and 1927 export figures American expenditures on trade promotion are only 76 per cent of those of the British Department of Overseas Trade. In other words, it would require an increase of \$1,310,000—from \$4,257,357 to \$5,567,357—to make the appropriations of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce equivalent to those of its British rival.

Even Japan is spending more proportionately than the United States. Considered on the same basis as Great Britain it would be necessary to increase the bureau's appropriations by \$763,000—from \$4,257,357 to \$5,020,357—to make them equivalent to the Japanese expenditures.

These figures do not tell the entire story by any manner of means. Take Great Britain as an example. The British Government has undertaken to spend approximately \$48,500,000—or at the rate of \$4,850,000 a year for 10 years—on the promotion of the sale of empire products within the empire. Although this is primarily a domestic sales campaign, it has a direct bearing on American trade, not only in the British Isles but also throughout the British dominions and colonies, which, taken as a unit, constitute our most important single market. In fact, 42 per cent of our total foreign commerce is with the empire.

Again, the British Government will spend in their fiscal year 1928-29 the sum of \$437,500 on the export credits guaranty department, an increase of \$185,000 over the 1927-28 appropriation. Since 1920 a revolving fund of \$126,000,000 has been set up to take care of the commitments guaranteed under this single piece of legislation which is directly concerned with British trade expansion.

Another type of indirect trade promotion on behalf of British trade is found in the East African loan act under which a revolving credit of \$48,600,000 has been created for the development of transportation facilities, such as railroads, roads, and harbors, in British East Africa. A large part of these credits will, it is expected, be utilized in the development of commerce in British machinery and equipment.

The growing importance of promotion activities in international trade is further emphasized by other examples. France is proposing to spend in 1929 over 25,000,000 francs on certain phases of her export drive. This does not tell the whole story, as this represents only part of the official expenditures. Due to the interlocking relations between the French trade-promotion bureau and French chambers of commerce, there are other expenditures which are not in the official budget.

Italy will spend in her fiscal year 1928-29 nearly seven and a half million lire for some of her trade activities. This does not include semiofficial items, such as are represented by the recent floating fair of Italian products which toured Latin America, displaying the best Italy could supply in many lines, the total value of the exhibits alone being 5,000,000 lire.

Australia furnished another interesting example. In London and Paris this enterprising dominion is spending, according to the 1927 Australian Yearbook, about \$125,000 a year at each post for trade promotion. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce will spend \$99,750 in the United Kingdom and \$90,025 in France. Even the Union of South Africa is in some respects spending more money than the United States. For instance, at Milan, Italy, where

both countries have offices, South Africa has a budget of \$55,000 as compared with an American expenditure of \$7,310.

The following table is inserted to show amounts appropriated for promoting our trade and the products or industries to which these sums are applied:

Appropriations for fiscal year 1928-29  
[Compared with the value of trades or products of industries served]

Industries or trades	Federal appropriations available directly for promotion work (non-regulatory functions) 1928-29	Value of product of industries served, 1926 or 1926-27	Appropriation per million dollars of product
Agriculture.....	<sup>1</sup> \$35,349,884	<sup>1</sup> \$13,000,000,000	\$2,719
Mining.....	<sup>2</sup> 4,419,100	<sup>2</sup> 5,520,000,000	800
Manufactures.....	<sup>3</sup> 4,294,255	<sup>3</sup> 62,714,000,000	68
Fisheries.....	<sup>4</sup> 2,140,748	<sup>4</sup> 135,000,000	15,857
Foreign commerce.....	<sup>5</sup> 9,972,690	<sup>5</sup> 9,023,000,000	662
Domestic commerce.....	290,000	<sup>6</sup> 70,000,000,000	4.1

<sup>1</sup> Does not include appropriations for such regulatory services as meat inspection, enforcement of grain futures act, enforcement of packers and stockyards act, etc., nor appropriation for "Forest Service," "Public roads," and "Flood relief."

<sup>2</sup> Estimated value of all farm products, 1926-27.

<sup>3</sup> Includes Bureau of Mines and Geological Survey appropriations, and two items of Bureau of Standards.

<sup>4</sup> Estimated value of metal and mineral products, 1927.

<sup>5</sup> Includes appropriations for Census Bureau and Bureau of Standards.

<sup>6</sup> Total value of manufactures of United States for 1925.

<sup>7</sup> Includes appropriations of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce (less item of \$290,000 for Domestic Commerce), and one-third of funds of Consular Service. Other two-thirds of consular appropriation is assumed to be for consular routine and regulatory functions.

<sup>8</sup> Total foreign trade in 1927-28 (exports plus imports).

<sup>9</sup> Excluding duplication; including the many resales the figure would probably be doubled.

Up to this point my remarks have been almost exclusively directed to European or, at least, Eastern Hemisphere countries. I feel it will be of interest and value in this discussion of trade-promotive activities to show at this time a comparison of imports into several of the nations located in the Western Hemisphere. These tables show not only the amount of goods imported but the place of origin and their percentage of the country's total importations:

#### CANADA

United States exports to Canada and expenditures by Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in Canada for trade promotion

	United States exports to Canada	Amount spent by bureau				
		Ottawa	Montreal	Toronto	Vancouver	Total
1924.....	\$624,031,000	\$15,027	—	—	—	\$15,027
1925.....	648,768,000	18,866	\$3,324	—	—	22,190
1926.....	738,568,000	22,620	7,762	\$3,612	—	33,994
1927.....	836,532,000	24,423	8,561	6,579	\$9,600	49,163
1928.....	1,769,505,000	—	—	—	—	—

<sup>1</sup> First 10 months of 1928.

#### BRAZIL

Imports into Brazil from Europe and the United States and expenditures by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in Brazil for trade promotion

Year	Europe		United States		Amount spent by bureau
	Dollars	Per cent of total	Dollars	Per cent of total	
1923.....	138,587,000	55	51,740,000	22	\$23,580
1924.....	177,627,000	58	73,808,000	24	37,406
1925.....	236,246,000	57	102,263,000	24	48,194
1926.....	212,285,000	54	114,626,000	29	40,043
1927.....	208,563,000	53	111,186,000	28	55,011

The bureau maintains offices at Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo.

Area: Brazil, 3,276,358 square miles; United States, 3,026,789 square miles.

#### ARGENTINA

Imports into Argentina from Europe and the United States and expenditures by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in Argentina for trade promotion

Year	Europe		United States		Amount spent by bureau
	Dollars	Per cent of total	Dollars	Per cent of total	
1923.....	439,331,000	64.4	142,539,000	20.9	\$28,750
1924.....	410,351,000	63.4	142,722,000	22.0	34,729
1925.....	491,487,000	61.3	188,487,000	23.5	47,949
1926.....	442,213,000	58.3	186,886,000	24.7	52,840
1927.....	( <sup>1</sup> )	—	( <sup>1</sup> )	—	54,537

<sup>1</sup> Figures not available.

Area: Argentina, 1,153,417 square miles; United States, 3,026,789 square miles.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes.

Mr. HARE. The gentleman speaks of the great increase in exports to Canada and these other countries. Speaking particularly of Canada, does the gentleman attribute that increase to the services rendered by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce?

Mr. ACKERMAN. To a great degree, to an increasing degree, and the amount of money that we have expended at the present time, furnished to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, for expansion of trade in Canada is a few dollars less than \$50,000.

Mr. HARE. The gentleman has made some very interesting statements, and I am very grateful to be able to listen to them. I am very much interested to note that the United States is quite able to compete in foreign markets with goods produced in foreign countries.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes.

Mr. HARE. Would the gentleman mind giving us his observation as to how we are able to do that, in view of the fact that our wage standard is so much higher here than in other countries.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I think it is the method of approach adopted by our American commercial representatives and attachés.

The splendid work of the State Department under Secretary Kellogg is ably supplemented by what is being done by the Department of Commerce, and the active cooperation of these two great forces so vigorously maintained and increasingly active is a welcome omen for an increase in volume which will surpass all previous records. That this will redound to the benefit of agriculture and contribute toward an improvement in any so-called farm problem there can not be the slightest doubt.

In London, Mr. Cooper, our commercial attaché, I have personally observed, has a splendid location for quickly reaching the English buyers, but the facilities of the office are far too small for the enormous increase of inquiries that have been worked up for American goods. The prime location at Bush House, Aldwych, right in the center of London's activities, must be permitted to function to the highest degree and some means must be found to give our representatives this, the additional quarters which I saw were urgently needed.

In Paris, where the offices are located in the chancellerie the close contact with the embassy proves of great value. Here is the great mart of Europe with its finger on the pulse beats of every nation without exception, not even excluding the Soviets. It requires wisdom of the highest order to handle these problems and that standard is maintained by the fine force where the Commerce Department is functioning in the Rue de Chaillot.

#### OVERCOMES DIFFICULTIES

In Belgium, and especially in Brussels, the Commerce Department's force of trained observers is making increased headway in competition with the great nations of Europe. Here is another spot where further consideration could be given to the additional facilities, very much needed, which would produce an abundant harvest. Belgium, although a small country territorially considered, is a beehive of industry, its network of railways being amply supplemented by a series of canals which allows of its products being transported at minimum cost, while the wages paid industrial workers do not exceed on the whole 25 per cent of what is paid in the United States. Necessarily, therefore, great skill and consummate tact must be exercised in getting favorable consideration for the products of the United States. Messrs. Hunt and Miller, of the Commerce Department's staff in Brussels are valiantly upholding the fine tradition of their offices, and are being rewarded by seeing American goods increasingly used.

The Press fair in Cologne, that great German city, proved a wonderful testimonial to the inventive genius of the Teutonic Nation, and will do much by rapid strides in overcoming whatever prestige may have been temporarily sidetracked by the events growing out of the World War.

#### GERMANY REGAINING

Germany is regaining her commerce and trade supremacy at a very rapid rate. The launching of the two monster vessels, the *Bremen* and *Europa*, which will be plowing the Atlantic next spring, will bring the Old World within five days and possibly less to our Atlantic coast. These carriers will lack nothing in the way of speed and comfort for the business or pleasure traveler and their enormous auxiliary cargo-carrying capacity will undoubtedly be utilized in filling orders for our goods. In Hamburg, Mr. Scott, of the Commerce Department, has a central location for his office.

The manner in which it reflects the United States throughout its appointments is well worthy of note and, indeed, might

prove a model for other offices. Everything in the office is of American manufacture—the carpets, the furniture, the electric-light fixtures, the bookcases, the books themselves, all breathe America continuously. What an admirable advertisement this affords.

Mr. Scott, who hails from Atlanta, is, in my opinion, a very capable individual, making a wonderful impression upon everyone with whom he comes in contact and increasing the trade of America by the clean, businesslike methods he employs in pushing the merits of American goods.

#### OFFICES IN OLD PALACE

Mr. Lawrence Grooves, a native of western New York, who has represented the Commerce Department in Germany, Hungary, and at Baltic ports, is now in Vienna. His offices there are in an old palace, but which is in good repair and very centrally located. It was obtained for the United States on a long lease during the reconstruction period at a very low rental. There is a large number of the unemployed in Austria, and it will take a number of years for the reconstituted country to absorb them; nevertheless Mr. Grooves has made wonderful progress and been highly successful in advancing the merits of the American tobacco manufacturers' products among the Austrians, in spite of the strong entrenchment of the Austrian and Hungarian tobacco monopolies. In France there is no unemployment. In Italy unemployment is decreasing. Nowhere in the world except in the United States are such wages paid to wage earners or where they ride to the places of occupation in motor vehicles of their own as in the United States.

#### SCOPE OF THE BUREAU'S WORK

The Bureau of Standards has been increasing its activities for better living conditions in the American home as well as better methods and practices in production and distribution of all articles of human consumption and usage.

Some, perhaps many, of you may ask, What is the Bureau of Standards? Let me give you the answer of Doctor Burgess, the very capable director: First, it is a collection of some 20 buildings on a 43-acre plot in the northwest suburb of Washington, equipped to carry out tests and investigations on all sorts of problems involving physics, chemistry, technology, and engineering; second, and more important, it is a group of some 850 men and women, most of whom are expert in some scientific field of activity and imbued with the spirit of discovery and service.

It is one of the great service bureaus of the Department of Commerce, concerned with science and industry, and equipped to perform laboratory and consulting functions for many departments of the Federal Government. It also helps the public in many matters relating to scientific and industrial research and standardization.

Its activities directly or indirectly concerned with the home are many and are constantly on the increase. They relate to the dwelling itself, its location and financing; the materials that enter into its construction, their properties, lasting qualities, and safety; the fixtures and utilities required, including plumbing, gas, and electricity; the accessories to the home, such as the automobile and radio; the comfort and well-being of the occupants, with their many problems of clothing, shoes, and household supplies—chinaware, hardware, glassware, and many other items in a long list—including quality of material and methods of purchase, all of daily concern to the housewife.

According to certain studies, 85 per cent of the goods sold at retail are purchased by women. As purchasing agents for the home, they, like the purchasing agents of corporations, are concerned with getting their money's worth. They want the right quality and full count or measure for the price paid.

Let us consider further what the Bureau of Standards, through Assistant Director Ray M. Hudson, has to say on this subject:

Businesses may have their treasurers, their comptrollers, even their boards of directors, who watch expenditures. By careful perusal of charts and graphs, by weighty conferences, they determine how annual income is to be spent.

But homes have their wives who do the same work in 26,000,000 independent businesses—the households of America. Without elaborate research, without the counsel, and the conferences of big business, these executives spend annually \$40,000,000,000. They spend it amazingly well, too, though they are not specialized purchasing agents any more than they are specialized cooks, or interior decorators, or educators, or furnace tenders.

Their decisions are governed by the welfare of their families. "Is this breakfast food better for my children to eat?" "Will this davenport and these curtains, this lamp, and this piano make my home a pleasanter place to be?" "Will this school give my daughter what I know she needs?" "Would another kind of heating equipment make our home more comfortable,



more healthful next winter?" These are samples of the questions they ask.

Always they visualize the ideal, these wives and mothers, before they consider economies. But they watch for economies as few business men do. By aptitude and training they are excellent shoppers. The competition for their attention, the courting of their favor, is tremendous. The way to their hearts and their purses is not easy, but it is clear. These general purchasing agents are readers of advertising, consistent, critical readers of advertising. It has been estimated that they buy more than 80 per cent of all advertised merchandise.

According to certain studies the bureau has made, women buy 95 per cent of the silk sold, 90 per cent of the jewelry, 84 per cent of the articles usually purchased in department stores, 82 per cent of the groceries, 80 per cent of the electrical supplies, 75 per cent of men's socks that are sold, 74 per cent of the drug store products, 73 per cent of the pianos, 65 per cent of the leather goods, 64 per cent of men's neckwear, 47 per cent of the hardware, and 40 per cent of the automobiles.

The savings wrought through her cooperation will not only enlarge the purchasing power of her dollars but will make it possible for thousands, possibly millions, more families to increase their possessions, and advance their living standards. In this connection a brief review of the present possessions of our 26,000,000 families is interesting. About one-half of them, or nearly 13,000,000, own their homes; 10,000,000 have phonographs, 6,000,000 have pianos, 5,000,000 have vacuum cleaners, 4,500,000 radios, 4,000,000 refrigerators, and 3,500,000 washing machines. There are 20,000,000 automobiles among our 26,000,000 families. We may assume these figures represent the relative order of importance of the average family's desires, for if it wanted washing machines or refrigerators as much as it does automobiles it would buy them.

This situation is very gratifying, indicating as it does a high degree of industrial stability and continued prosperity for our people. A sidelight on this latter condition is shown in the current distribution of over \$550,000,000 to the 8,000,000 Christmas club members by over 8,000 banks and financial institutions throughout the United States. This distribution is estimated to be 10 per cent greater than that for 1927.

#### INSURANCE INCREASING

Another sidelight is found in the fact that for the first nine months of 1928 the amount of new insurance written by the 45 companies reporting is \$9,058,081,000, or nearly \$1,000,000,000 more than for the same period in 1927.

Savings-bank deposits rose from \$13,040,000,000 in 1919 to \$26,091,000,000 in 1927, an increase of 100 per cent in eight years.

Many other evidences of greater individual wealth can be cited, but the significant fact is that this increase is the result of our progress in national efficiency. This in turn is the result of the elimination of waste in production and distribution, the widespread application of simplification and standardization, the development and use of more labor-saving machinery, and the increased productive output of the individual.

Underlying all this improvement is the great contribution made by scientific research. The findings of science are being more widely accepted, applied, and used by industry to-day than at any time in the history of our country.

Coincident with the increase in individual prosperity reflected in the foregoing has come a higher standard of living, one in which quality is paramount. Our people have learned that through mass production and the elimination of waste in industry goods can be made to sell at relatively lower prices, but they do not want cheap or shoddy goods at any price. They are demanding that goods shall be made well, shall wear well, and give good service. They are demanding also that goods shall have more art or style in them and be more attractive in appearance and finish.

In response to these demands industries are employing research methods and making greater use of the research laboratories of the country, particularly of our Bureau of Standards.

The bureau is constantly cooperating with industries in the refinement and improvement of basic materials, such as textiles, leather, rubber, paper, glass, chemicals, dyes, metals, and also building materials, such as cement, clay products, and the like.

Not only is the bureau aiding in the direct improvement of the materials but also of the processes and equipment by which those materials are prepared for further use.

New standards are being set for grades and qualities of essential materials and commodities, and the demand by industry for service from the bureau in this latter field is steadily increasing.

Among the standards established to date through this cooperative service are those for clinical thermometers, staple porcelain plumbing fixtures, steel pipe nipples, genuine wrought-iron

pipe nipples, and standard-weight malleable iron or steel screwed unions.

Other projects for which commercial standards are being developed include surgical gauze, brass pipe nipples, furnace and fuel oils, regain in mercerized-cotton yarns. The value of commercial standards is well illustrated in their application to the latter item for the establishment of a commercial standard providing for a uniform moisture content and regain in mercerized yarns, will furnish a standard basis for marketing and obviate or avoid the controversies now occurring between buyers and sellers over weights of this commodity.

There is great need and therefore opportunity in the commodity field for the establishment of commercial standards of grade and quality to give the consumer greater assurance of full value in his purchases, to increase confidence and good will for the merchant, and to help the manufacturer eliminate waste in production.

To-day there are many manufactured articles the outward appearance of which is so similar as to prevent any ready comparison of quality by the majority of buyers without resort to elaborate or expensive laboratory tests. Consequently, goods are often purchased on a price basis and without full knowledge of their true quality.

The purpose of commercial standards is to make it possible for the small as well as the large purchaser to buy according to specification without having to test the material or article as delivered to see whether or not it meets the specification. Proof on this point is found in public certification through the use of proper labels and advertising by the manufacturer that the goods meet the commercial standard adopted for them and indorsed by the United States Bureau of Standards.

Already 1,022 manufacturers interested in 146 Federal specifications have signified their willingness to certify, when requested, that goods furnished by them on orders calling for such delivery are according to these specifications.

The success with which the commercial-standards program is meeting indicates it will be followed by many of our principal industries seeking to strengthen public confidence and good will for their products and to protect the latter's good name.

#### SIMPLIFIED PRACTICE

The success of the bureau's cooperation in simplification is demonstrated by the fact that over 100 simplified practice recommendations are now in effect and are being well adhered to or observed by the industries to which they apply.

Completed programs include the reduction of varieties of paving brick from 66 to 5; files and rasps from 1,351 to 475; plow bolts from 1,500 to 840; varieties of shovels, spades, and scoops from 5,136 to 2,178; of solid-section steel windows from 42,877 to 2,244; and of grinding wheels from 715,200 to 254,400.

Sixty other simplifications are under way. Among the commodities covered by them are photographic paper, beverage bottles, hospital plumbing fixtures, coopers' wares, medicine chests or cabinets, and glass containers for the drug and pharmaceutical industries.

Since January 1, 1928, 21 simplifications have been effected; 23 of those previously completed have been reaffirmed, and 9 others revised to meet current needs and conditions.

In the 11 months, to December 1, 1928, the acceptors of the completed simplification programs have increased from 7,731 individual firms and corporations to 11,319, a gain of 46 per cent. This response testifies that business finds worth while benefits in simplified practice.

Six years ago, the dry-cleaning industry appealed to the Government for assistance in research work. The Government acceded to this request on one condition: That the problems attacked should be of interest to, and the result should be available to, the entire industry. "Entire industry" was defined as being made up of a minority composed of dry cleaners and a majority composed of the general public as ultimate consumers. The national association has consistently gone more than half way in meeting this viewpoint. In consequence, the results have astonished both parties.

That the work has been of value to the industry is amply proved by the enthusiasm with which it is financially supported. The Government is rewarded for its efforts partly by the increased prosperity of the dry-cleaning industry, which is one of the items making up the prosperity of American business; partly by the knowledge that the general public is now getting better service than was formerly possible; partly by the fact that the damage to garments due to dry cleaning has been materially reduced, thereby adding just so much to the effective income of the customers. The known germicidal effects of dry cleaning may have some beneficial effect on public health. The adoption, as a standard, of a solvent less flammable than gasoline has reduced the risk to life and property, which fact has already been recognized by lower insurance rates.

Much progress has been made through the reduction of waste in production. Simplification and standardization have helped greatly.

The success of simplification in the United States has been watched closely by foreign nations. As a result the Japanese can manufacturers examined 2,134 varieties of canned goods put up in Japan, found 250 different styles of cans, and standardized on 14. They said, "Our aim is for superior quality at the lowest possible price."

More recently the Australian Commonwealth organized an engineering standards, also a simplified practice association "to develop Australian industry, eliminate waste in manufacture, reduce cost of production, simplify distribution, stabilize employment, and promote a spirit of cooperation between divergent trade interests."

Simplification is extending beyond our factories into general business. A few years ago the American Bankers' Association simplified bank-check sizes. Its former president, T. R. Preston, says: "Universal adoption of these standards will save \$20,000,000 a year." Printers have estimated that simplification has reduced the cost of checks by \$2.50 per thousand. To-day 85 per cent of all checks issued are simplified checks.

In fields where simplification is not applicable to the products or services sold it is being applied to purchases. The Philadelphia company reviewed the 16,000 forms it was using, discontinued 72, revised 9, consolidated 45 to 22, reduced its letterheads from 161 to 27, pen points from 30 to 6, and so on. This enabled the company to coordinate its purchases, and buy these items of supply in larger quantities and at lower prices.

The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad cut its inventory 71 per cent by eliminating 25 per cent of the items formerly carried in its supply stocks, and thereby released nearly two and one-half million dollars of otherwise idle capital.

Not only have other countries, factories, and general business adopted simplification methods developed at the Bureau of Standards, but municipalities are also employing them to good advantage.

The city of Milwaukee under its recently installed centralized and coordinated purchasing system saved its citizens in one year \$432,000 on a volume of \$4,000,000.

To date 90 simplifications have been effected in as many different commodity lines, through the cooperative efforts of the manufacturers, distributors, and consumers concerned. It is conservatively estimated by industry that this activity is yielding benefits and savings in excess of \$300,000,000 annually. It costs the taxpayers from \$50,000 to \$85,000 a year to maintain.

It can not be too emphatically stated that in this simplification movement there has been no Government coercion. The results have been attained by voluntary cooperation of the interested parties, using the Government agency to bring them together and indorse and support their collective efforts toward eliminating the wastes inherent in overdiversification of product. Only when 80 per cent of the interested parties indorse a project does the Government promulgate it. The simplification idea has been sold to a considerable body of the American business public, and the problem now is to keep the ball a-rolling.

#### COLOR STANDARDS

A field of technical standardization which is becoming of greater and greater importance is grading by color and basing sales prices for many commodities on color determinations. For example, some \$230,000,000 worth of vegetable oils are sold per year, all on a color basis. The bureau has calibrated a master set of glasses for control of this product and is now engaged in supplying substandards to the trade. There are many food products of which color is considered of importance. These include cheese, sirup, oleomargarine and butter, meat, chocolate, tomatoes, sugar, and many others. I cite the case of color as one illustration of a rapidly developing field of standardization of particular interest to your business, a field of very considerable complexity from the laboratory point of view, but of great importance practically. Other industries were also interested, such as paint, textile, and glass.

I trust it is not inappropriate to mention the fact to the members of the Committee of the Whole that the members of the subcommittee handling this bill, in addition to their being thoroughly sympathetic with the activities of the department concerned, are in a position to visualize the various situations as they are brought in review by the bureau chiefs having the matters in charge. Fortunate indeed is the country that can enlist the services of such an able, untiring chairman as Mr. SHREVE, or as that of the ranking member of the minority, Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Together with the other members they have traveled collectively in excess of a million miles in viewing the localities which are receiving departmental consideration and support, both domestic and foreign. The departments, realizing that sympathetic consideration is accorded but that rigid scrutiny will be exercised concerning any proposition advanced, are encouraged in their all-the-year-round work by this fact—a circumstance fraught with great benefit to the whole community. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I have a letter from a very prominent citizen in New Orleans, Mr. Frank Dameron, asking me to do what I can to be of assistance in the way of securing for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce as liberal appropriations as the circumstances would warrant. Has the committee considered all of the factors in the case?

Mr. ACKERMAN. They have tried to, and I believe the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE], will speak further on that subject.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting at this point a very concise table showing past Budget estimates, total appropriations, and amounts saved by Congress since the Budget was first instituted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The table is as follows:

Congress and fiscal years	Total Budget estimates	Total appropriations	Decrease (—) or increase (+), appropriations compared with Budget estimates	Net decrease in Budget estimates
Sixty-seventh Congress, first and second sessions:				
Fiscal year 1923, regular annual, permanent, and indefinite.....	\$3,924,586,066.78	\$3,751,917,629.14	—\$172,668,437.64	
Supplemental and deficiencies for fiscal year 1923 and prior years.....	467,571,992.68	327,878,638.05	—139,693,354.63	
Total.....	4,392,158,059.46	4,079,796,267.19	—312,361,792.27	—\$312,361,792.27
Sixty-seventh Congress, third and fourth sessions:				
Fiscal year 1924, regular annual, permanent, and indefinite.....	3,714,602,281.19	3,706,779,083.12	—7,823,198.07	
Supplemental and deficiencies for fiscal year 1923 and prior years.....	236,411,166.57	233,492,860.49	—2,918,306.08	
Total.....	3,951,013,447.76	3,940,271,943.61	—10,741,504.15	—10,741,504.15
Sixty-eighth Congress, first session:				
Fiscal year 1925, regular annual, permanent, and indefinite.....	3,632,173,654.96	3,622,125,959.19	—10,047,695.77	
Supplemental and deficiencies for fiscal year 1924 and prior years.....	160,974,906.47	161,097,365.16	+1,022,458.69	
Total.....	3,793,147,961.43	3,784,123,324.35	—9,024,637.08	—9,024,637.08
Sixty-eighth Congress, second session:				
Fiscal year 1926, regular annual, permanent, and indefinite.....	3,747,876,017.78	3,736,124,593.31	—11,751,424.47	
Supplemental and deficiencies for fiscal year 1925 and prior years.....	416,402,528.03	415,567,454.60	—845,073.43	
Total.....	4,164,278,545.81	4,151,682,047.91	—12,596,497.90	—12,596,497.90
Sixty-ninth Congress, first session:				
Fiscal year 1927, regular annual, permanent, and indefinite.....	3,961,470,187.42	3,953,628,990.08	—7,841,197.34	
Supplemental and deficiencies for fiscal year 1926 and prior years.....	454,709,266.73	455,834,399.73	+1,125,133.00	
Total.....	4,416,179,454.15	4,409,463,389.81	—6,716,064.34	—6,716,064.34



Congress and fiscal years	Total Budget estimates	Total appropriations	Decrease (-) or increase (+), appropriations compared with Budget estimates	Net decrease in Budget estimates
Sixty-ninth Congress, second session:				
Fiscal year 1928, regular annual, permanent, and indefinite.....	\$4,022,971,757.60	\$4,014,988,936.40	-\$7,982,821.20	
Supplemental and deficiencies for fiscal year 1927 and prior years.....	195,792,534.01	196,022,416.18	+229,882.17	
Total.....	4,218,764,291.61	4,211,011,352.58	-7,752,939.03	-\$7,752,939.03
Seventieth Congress, first session:				
Fiscal year 1929, regular annual, permanent, and indefinite.....	4,332,235,695.16	4,322,208,922.06	-10,026,773.10	
Supplemental and deficiencies for fiscal year 1928 and prior years.....	305,141,118.98	306,027,902.57	+886,783.59	
Total.....	4,637,376,814.14	4,628,236,824.63	-9,139,989.51	-9,139,989.51
Grand total net reduction in Budget estimates since the beginning.....				-368,333,422.28

Mr. BACON. It is customary to criticize the Congress for extravagance. The above record since the establishment of the Bureau of the Budget proves the falsity of this accusation. During the past seven years the Congress has cut down the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget by the large total of \$368,333,422.28.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. WINTER].

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen of the committee, I realize it is not a very propitious time to address the House, and for that reason I shall insert under leave some matters in the RECORD which I had hoped to present here on the floor. I am sure that you all enjoyed, as I did, the able and interesting address made by a preceding speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN]. I wish that there might have been a full attendance of Members to have heard it.

Prior to the consideration of the bill now before us we passed the Interior appropriation bill and the agricultural appropriation bill.

Those two bills have to do in certain of their provisions with a common subject. The Interior bill appropriated, among other things, for reclamation. The agricultural bill had a great deal to do in many of its provisions with the encouragement and promotion of agriculture and the application of funds for research work looking toward the improvement of agriculture and the increasing of the amount of production. There was, therefore, an interrelation between the two bills.

It is not my purpose to indulge in an argument with reference to reclamation. I would like to give you a very brief picture, a bird's-eye view, as it were, of the reclamation activities of the Government. It is now some 26 years since the reclamation act was passed. As the result of those 26 years of activity there have been brought under irrigation 1,956,910 acres. That has been done at a cost of \$175,116,945. There has been created as a result of these activities and the capital and labor of the settlers a valuation of something in excess of \$600,000,000. The total value of the annual crop of last year from these 24 projects was \$133,207,210, which, you will note, is about 1 per cent of the value of the total agricultural production of the entire country, which is in the neighborhood of \$13,000,000,000. During 1926, at a time when the settlers were still under considerable disability and disadvantage, they repaid into the reclamation fund the sum of \$4,260,221.35. Last year, 1927, they repaid the sum of \$5,299,149.15, an increase in the one year over the prior year's payment of \$1,038,928.20.

There was received during the last year from various sources going to make up the reclamation fund, in addition to these payments of \$5,299,149.55 by settlers, the sum of \$705,822.66 from the receipts from the sale of public lands and the sum of \$2,454,168.68 from mineral royalties collected by the Government under the general mineral leasing act. From these three sources the total amount paid into the reclamation fund last year was \$8,459,140.87. In addition to the 1,956,910 acres occupied and irrigated on the reclamation projects we have 160,000 acres unoccupied but ready for irrigation and for settlers. Unfortunately those 160,000 acres are concentrated in five particular projects, and therefore present a problem of serious concern as to the ability of these five projects to meet their contracts and obligations to the Government. But they can be made to do so. These projects can each be made a complete success and the return of the investment of the Government insured.

There is pending before the Congress a bill known as the aided and directed settlement bill, H. R. 9956, upon which extensive hearings have been held and upon which there is a favorable report before the House. Its purpose is to bring about the settlement of this particular 160,000 acres of vacant land on the

five particular projects; and I would bespeak from the Members of the House a careful and earnest reading of the hearings on that bill and of the bill itself and of the report filed therewith.

My remarks to-day are prompted by the repeated observations of Members here on the floor who have announced their opposition to bringing under cultivation any more farm land. Those remarks usually were made in connection with and in opposition to any more authorizations by this body of new reclamation projects. There also has been uninformed and unwarranted propaganda against reclamation and new projects by the Chicago Tribune, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Society of Civil Engineers, and the Department of Agriculture. Analysis of the situation demonstrates they are wrong.

Those of us who come from the arid States of the West are fairly well satisfied with the provisions of the Interior Department appropriation bill, which passed this House, in that it made provision for the continuation of the construction of a number of existing projects which have heretofore been authorized. There was no particular opposition in the House to that bill in that respect. But there were sentiments expressed here in opposition to reclamation progress which I am sure were founded on an erroneous conception of the conditions and the facts; and these observations and remarks which I now make and matters which I desire to insert in the RECORD are designed to dissipate what I consider to be a mistaken impression as to the effect of reclamation and the production of crops upon reclamation projects upon the agricultural situation in this country; and to bring to your minds the fact that they do not in fact add in any appreciable way to the crop surplus or to the so-called farm problem.

As a basis for what I wish to say and to insert in the RECORD, I quote from President Roosevelt in his message to Congress in 1901, prior to the passage of the reclamation act. He said:

It is as right for the National Government to make the streams and rivers of the arid region useful by engineering works for water storage as to make useful the rivers and harbors of the humid region by engineering works of another kind. The storing of the floods in reservoirs at the headwaters of our rivers is but an enlargement of our present policy of river control, under which levees are built on the lower reaches of the same streams.

And in this connection, and in connection with that quotation from President Roosevelt, I note and mention in passing that portion of the bill for the control of the floods of the Mississippi which provided for the simultaneous survey of tributaries of that river, and which devoted \$5,000,000 of that appropriation to that purpose. By that provision we are getting right back to the original, and in my judgment the right, idea of flood control. In connection with that control of the tributaries of that stream we have the accompanying benefits of flow regulation, improved navigation, the creation of storage for irrigation, storage for water power, and the production of electrical energy.

Again I quote from President Roosevelt as follows:

The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every portion of our country, just as the settlement of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the Atlantic States. The increased demand for manufactured articles will stimulate industrial production, while wider home markets and the trade of Asia will consume the larger food supplies and effectually prevent western competition with eastern agriculture. Indeed, the products of our irrigation will be consumed chiefly in upbuilding local centers of mining and other industries, which would not otherwise come into existence at all. Our people as a whole will profit, for successful home making is but another name for the upbuilding of the Nation.

Those words were true when spoken in 1901, and they are just as true to-day.

It is well known that the farm surplus problem has to do principally with the crops of corn, wheat, and cotton. These comprise a very small part of irrigated crops. There is no competition between these reclamation projects and central and eastern agriculture. The crops produced on the reclamation projects are not competitive. They are mainly special crops, such as the sugar beet, seed potatoes, seed beans and seed peas, and early vegetables; and most of the products other than those just named are used in feeding livestock. In other words, all these products are consumed locally, and of course, therefore, they do not come on the market into competition with the products of the other agricultural States.

I want to quote from a public statement made by President Coolidge about two years ago—perhaps three—along this same line, as follows:

criticism of such a program of encouragement—

And he was speaking of new reclamation projects—

on the ground that there already is an overproduction in agricultural products lies in the lack of understanding that these projects take many years for development; that they furnish but a small portion of the total increased food supply required even by our increase in population; and that the utilization of their supplies lies in the development itself.

President-elect Hoover in a recent address called attention to the fact that we are importing into this country annually \$800,000,000 worth of farm products which we can raise and ought to raise in this country. Certainly our eastern brethren will agree that they would prefer to have these products raised in this country and in the western arid regions rather than to import them from foreign countries, and it is our hope that in the expected tariff readjustment or revision there will be such tariffs levied as will make it possible to raise in this country this nearly \$1,000,000,000 worth of food products which we now import but which we ourselves could raise.

Again, we should maintain in this country a proper balance between agriculture and industry. I wish I had the time to elaborate upon this proposition and call attention to the gradual transformation that has occurred in this country from the early day when we were 70 to 80 per cent agricultural until now we are probably from 60 to 70 per cent industrial instead of agricultural.

The President has called attention to the fact that we are gradually becoming an industrial Nation instead of an agricultural Nation. I say it would be a false economic principle for America at least, if we should join in the view of those countries—such as England—which are practically manufacturing countries and are dependent upon foreign countries for the very food upon which their people must live. I say we should maintain a proper balance of agricultural production in this country, and that, while we are producing abundantly at the present time, President Coolidge has called attention to the fact, in addition to these other things, that with our increasing population it will not be many years until we are not raising sufficient food for our own people. I have here a quotation from Secretary Jardine, made before a reclamation conference in this city two years ago, in which he stated that within 10 years we would have to have more acres under cultivation and greater production in this country to provide for our own people. Our increasing population comes to us at the rate of 1,500,000 from natural increase and perhaps 200,000 by immigration, even under our restricted immigration act, and undoubtedly there are a number who come unlawfully into the country. The annual total is thus nearly 2,000,000. In a period of 10 years this means an increase of 20,000,000.

I wish to call attention to the fact that if a reclamation project is authorized on this good day, depending upon its size, it would not contribute to the agricultural production of this Nation for from 10, 15, to 20 years, and when we take into consideration the certain increase in population it will not do to wait for the 10, 15, or 20 years to pass to authorize and begin a project. That should be done at this time in reasonable, regular order. Reclamation should be allowed to come on naturally and gradually as it has heretofore without cessation.

I call your attention next to the fact that the total contribution by all of the reclamation projects, which have been built in 26 years, last year was but 1 per cent of the total agricultural production of the Nation. In other words, by all the expenditures and all the labor of the Reclamation Service, and all the capital and labor of the settlers, we have increased the agricultural production of this Nation but one twenty-sixth of 1 per cent annually during the 26 years we have been active under the reclamation act.

The President called attention, in the remarks I have quoted, to the fact that these projects not only consume their own prod-

ucts, but constitute a market for the rest of the country, not only for manufactured products but for the very staple agricultural products of wheat, corn, and cotton, of which there is a surplus. Instead of adding to the number of bushels or bales of these products, these projects create a demand and help to consume the staple products which go to make up the real farm surplus and problem. These projects have created and maintain a market annually for manufactured products of \$500,000,000.

Another thing which ought to be considered is that in these arid Western States there is on the average but from 5 to 7 per cent of their total area which is susceptible of irrigation. The rest of the area of those States is made up of mountainous country or of plains which are grazing lands, which can never be reached by any water that is available. These States, it seems to me, under these conditions, are reasonable in their request that reclamation shall proceed in an orderly way and not be cut off from consideration, and shall not cease because of a temporary depressed condition of agriculture as to products to whose surplus it does not add and with which its special products do not come in competition.

It would seem that these States, when we consider that the other agricultural States have 100 per cent of their area under cultivation, or capable of cultivation, should at least be entitled to have a development up to the possible 5 per cent of their entire area. In my State at the present time, consisting of 62,000,000 acres, there are less than 2,000,000 acres of land actually under irrigation. The utmost we can ever hope for is 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 acres, or from 5 to 7 per cent of our area.

The reclamation policy is but following out our general policy of a homestead provision for the making of homes in this country. When these arid lands are prepared by the Federal Government under the law, and by storage works water is made available, they are then homesteaded by home seekers. The United States Supreme Court has sustained the reclamation law upon the theory that the Government has the right to improve its own lands for the purpose of making them habitable and for the purpose of furnishing possible homes for future homesteaders.

In this connection, I wish to mention the fact that there are bills pending before the Congress which not only propose to regulate and lease the balance of the unreserved and unappropriated public domain, 194,000,000 acres, but which contain express provisions repealing the homestead laws. Such bills should be opposed and that great policy preserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield for a question or does he prefer not to yield?

Mr. WINTER. If it is a brief question, I yield.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman is making an interesting and enlightening statement and I am enjoying it very much. The gentleman may have covered it in the first part of his speech, when I was not present, but I am wondering if the gentleman favors linking flood control and irrigation projects, or is there need of that in the particular section he has in mind?

Mr. WINTER. If I get the purport of the gentleman's question, in our section of the country, yes. All of our tributaries upon the eastern side of the Rockies flow into the Mississippi, and I have mentioned the connection between storage for irrigation, power, and flood control.

Mr. JONES. That was probably before I came in. The reason I asked the question is that in discussing these matters some have taken the position that this water is a curse and have tried to get rid of it in the lower channels of the rivers instead of utilizing the water and producing a good result.

Mr. WINTER. One of the greatest paragraphs in the speech of acceptance of Herbert Hoover was that which started out with the statement that every drop of water which flows unused to the sea is an economic waste, and in that same paragraph he immediately followed that statement up with the correlated subjects of flood control, regulation of flow, water transportation, irrigation, and power. Altogether it presents a picture and a practical possibility of a magnificent development.

Mr. JONES. Then the gentleman thinks that proper flood control will enable us to utilize the water for good purposes higher up in the tributary streams?

Mr. WINTER. Certainly; that is the true economic way of treating this flood-control problem.

And, finally I quote from the last message of the President upon the general proposition, as follows:

For many years the Federal Government has been committed to the wise policy of reclamation and irrigation. While it has met with some failures, due to unwise selection of projects and lack of thorough soil



surveys, so that they could not be placed on a sound business basis, on the whole the service has been of such incalculable benefit in so many States that no one would advocate its abandonment.

[Applause.]

I want to mention and ask the Members to read an article written by Mr. B. E. Stoutmeyer, of the legal staff of the Reclamation Service, which can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 7, page 220.

I would ask leave to insert, without reading, an article written by Mr. Charles Niethammer, of the Casper Packing Co., upon the subject of reclamation, farm surplus, and the farm problem in general. It takes a proposed new project, the Casper-Alcova project, and by concrete example and analysis proves conclusively that the fear of added surplus is unfounded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

AN ANSWER IN BEHALF OF THE CASPER-ALCOVA PROJECT TO THE PROPAGANDA REGARDING THE OVERPRODUCTION OF FARM CROPS BEING WIDELY CIRCULATED AGAINST THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF WESTERN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

This article is by Mr. Charles Niethammer, of the Casper Packing Co., who, by virtue of his experience in the buying and feeding of livestock and on account of his interest in and study of the Casper-Alcova project, is amply qualified to write on this subject.

CASPER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
Casper, Wyo.

Considerable opposition has been voiced lately against the development of additional irrigation projects on the grounds of an existing overproduction of certain farm products.

We desire to show that such objections are applicable to such a slight extent, if at all, to the proposed Casper-Alcova project that they should not in fairness be given serious consideration. There is no existing overproduction in connection with any of the main crops that could be raised on this project, and so far as this region is concerned the need for this development is more urgent, more imperative, than ever, due to the changed conditions in the livestock industry.

During the last 25 years the value of cattle in our State has increased from \$13,000,000 to \$50,000,000. The number of sheep has increased from 2,000,000 to over 4,000,000 head, and their value has mounted from \$4,000,000 to \$35,000,000.

When cows were selling at \$15 a head and ewes at \$2 per head, buying feed for them was out of the question. They were wintered through on the open range, with an occasional hard winter wiping out a part of the herd. With cows selling at \$75 and ewes at \$10 to \$12 per head, stockmen can no longer take chances on the weather. The State produces an entirely insufficient amount of feed to maintain the livestock industry on a sound basis and provision must be made for greater protection against hard winters. That can only be done by raising a greater amount of feed right here, as it is not practical to ship in feed. The result has been that cowmen have cut their herds to a size that they can easily carry through the winter, much to the disadvantage of the State and of the country at large.

It has come to our attention that appeals are being made from certain sources that we should lower tariff on feeder cattle from Canada and Mexico in order to keep beef within the reach of the laboring man. The shortage is real enough—if greater numbers of cattle were shipped to the market this fall than were expected, it was due to the fact that the unusually high prices prevailing in the early part of the season caused many cattle to be shipped that should have been held over and used in restocking the range. By putting the cattle business of the West on a more substantial basis, the country will be assured of an ample supply of beef without opening the gates to foreign competition.

These high values are not temporary, but are due to conditions which have been long in forming. Since 1900 the per capita number of cattle and sheep in the United States has decreased 50 per cent and any increase to come will likely be at no greater rate than the increase in population. Under present prices, a series of hard winters, without ample supply of feed, may cause losses almost as great as the cost of the entire Casper-Alcova project.

The proposed Casper-Alcova project occupies a very strategic position as a point for wintering livestock. It is situated in the heart of an immense range country and is easily accessible from all sides. Within the territory, which it will serve directly as a feeding place, there are grazing to-day over 500,000 sheep and 40,000 head of cattle. There is no question as to the advantages of winter feeding of sheep, for aside from producing bigger and stronger lambs, it increases the wool clip approximately 2 pounds per head.

Out of the 500,000 lambs raised here each year about 100,000 are retained as breeding ewes. Without exception these lambs could be brought to the project for wintering as most of them now are fed part of the winter on the high-priced feed shipped in here from other places. A number of old ewes, approximating the number of breeding lambs

held back, must be shipped to market each year, whereas a great majority of these ewes would be good for one or two more lamb crops if they could be wintered on feed. A very safe estimate for the total of ewes, which in normal years would be wintered on the project, would be 150,000. The return to the project from this source would be in excess of \$350,000 and a good part of this would be for roughage and other feed not easily disposed of. During a hard winter, the project would act as a safeguard for all the sheep run in the adjacent territory.

The cattle business would be a counterpart of the sheep business only on a smaller scale. During the last 10 years the cattle business has changed largely to a cow-and-calf business. The growing demand for baby beef has made it profitable for the stockmen to sell their increase as calves or yearlings, whereas in former years most of the steers were carried until they were three and four year olds and were less apt to suffer on the range during the winter months. This means that it is necessary to keep a much greater percentage of breeding cows and young cattle than formerly and consequently there exists a much greater need for feed during the winter.

Just how many cattle may eventually be cared for on this project can only be approximated, of course. With the existence of a sufficient supply of feed the cattle business would thrive in this section as the range can handle a great many more than are being run here at the present time. The number of calves and breeding cows that would, under present conditions, be brought onto the project to be wintered, together with the number of lambs and ewes, would furnish an outlet for the crops from nearly one-third of the total acreage of the Casper project.

Objections may be made by Corn Belt feeders that too great a development of irrigation in the range States would deprive them of their supply of feeder cattle and leave them without a satisfactory means of disposing of their crop. As has already been pointed out, we are now selling mostly young cattle, and a much greater percentage of our cattle consists of calves and cows than ever before. The most profitable way of utilizing feed crops from a project such as this would be to merely winter the stock and sell them off the range in the summer and fall.

Owing to the small acreage of grain usually raised on Wyoming projects, hardly any cattle are finished here. A part of them may be put on short feed, but these are mostly shipped as feeders early in the spring.

From the above it can be seen that there exists not only a strong potential market but a very urgent need for a large percentage of the crops that can be produced on this project. This is a market, owing to the impracticability of shipping in feed, which can be supplied in no other way than by growing the feed here at home. Not a pound of this feed would in any manner add to the overproduction, since it would only be used in safeguarding the investment and improving the quality of our livestock.

The foundation of our State's prosperity is the livestock business, and we must protest against any attempt to deny the people of Wyoming the right of this irrigation development—on the grounds of an existing overproduction of farm crops—when there is no apparent overproduction of the kind of crops raised on irrigation projects in Wyoming. Such a program would only serve to injure this State's prosperity without in any way solving the problem of overproduction.

The figures so far cited take no account of any expansion in the sheep industry that would result locally through the establishing of this project. For a number of years lamb has not been available as a food item to the average family owing to its high price.

Feeder lambs have been selling from 11 cents to 13 cents per pound at shipping time. They can profitably be sold at 9 cents per pound, which would result in a much greater demand for the meat and would make room for considerable expansion in the sheep industry. A dependable supply of feed would enable sheep owners of this section to increase their operations sufficiently to make up for the decrease in price. Certainly nothing could be more desirable than to increase the wool production of this country, which at the present time imports nearly as much as it grows. (The United States imported 264,000,000 pounds of wool in 1927 and produced 328,000,000 pounds; no overproduction here.)

Next in importance to the forage crops on this project would be the raising of sugar beets. Based on percentages prevailing in this State, between 11,000 and 12,000 acres of the Casper-Alcova project would eventually be planted to this crop. Favorable soil and climatic conditions in Wyoming have made beet raising a very profitable undertaking for the farmer. The great numbers of livestock in the area adjacent to Casper would be a decided help to the beet growers and sugar refineries in furnishing a market for the beet tops and beet pulp. With the United States producing only about one-fifth of the sugar that is being consumed in this country, the argument of overproduction can hardly be applied against this crop. The United States imported 4,126,000 tons of sugar in 1927 and continental United States produced only 1,164,000 tons.

While feed crops and sugar beets may be the two largest single items produced, the possibilities for diversification in the Mountain States will assure the project a large acreage given to the growing of special crops particularly suited to this region. Chief among such crops being raised

in this State are dry beans, seed peas, certified seed beans, and other certified seed crops. The raising of these crops, along with the growing of turkeys, was begun in our State on a large scale in 1921.

In 1928, three of these crops—i. e., turkeys, dry beans, and certified seed—exceeded, respectively, the million-dollar mark, according to agricultural statistics for the State. With an acreage only one-third as large as the proposed Casper-Alcova project, one irrigated district in the State in 1928 produced nearly 100 carloads of beans. Another small community shipped six carloads of turkeys to the New York market. The climate and altitude made for a hardness in our certified seed, which make them much sought after by States that import their seed supply. What portion of the acreage of this project might be employed in this manner is difficult to determine in advance, but an analysis of the carload shipments of a representative territory within the State of Wyoming, containing about 35,000 irrigated acres, will show better perhaps than anything else how little Wyoming projects produce of such items as are most subject to overproduction. This district, outside of livestock, shipped in 1927, 505 carloads of produce, divided as follows:

Carloads of—	
Sugar	395
Dry beans	65
Seed peas	3
Wool	23
Honey	2
Turkeys	3
Alfalfa meal	4
Wheat	8
Potatoes	2

Out of a total of 505 carloads there were only 8 carloads of grain, and this mostly from adjacent dry-land sections. A large part of the crops of this project were, of course, used in the feeding and wintering of livestock.

Summing up the various points, it is obvious that the crops of the proposed Casper-Alcova project would not add to the overproduction existing in some farm products for the following reasons:

First. Because a large percentage of the acreage would be used for wintering cattle and sheep which are now being run on the open range.

Second. Because a large part of this acreage would be devoted to the growing of sugar, of which the United States now imports four times as much as is produced in this country. (Imports, 1927, 4,216,000 tons; United States production, 1,164,000 tons.)

Third. Because it would increase the production of wool, of which the United States imports nearly half of our total requirements. (Imports, 1927, 264,000,000 pounds; United States production, 328,000,000 pounds.)

Fourth. Because a large part of the acreage would be used in the growing of special crops, in which no overproduction exists, and some of which (certified seed) actually are a great help to agricultural interests of other States on account of the exceptionally high quality and virility of the seed grown in this altitude and climate.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. TILSON] having resumed the chair, Mr. LEAVITT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15569) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 20, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, December 20, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

##### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

First deficiency appropriation bill.

Independent offices appropriation bill.

##### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Requesting the President to propose the calling of an international conference for the simplification of the calendar, or to accept, on behalf of the United States, an invitation to participate in such a conference (H. J. Res. 334).

#### COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

(10 a. m.)

To amend the first paragraph of section 7 of the act entitled, "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, approved February 28, 1925" (H. R. 11622).

To amend the first paragraph, and that portion of paragraph 4 as far as the first colon, of section 2 of the act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, approved February 28, 1925" (H. R. 13709).

To classify certain positions in the Railway Mail Service (H. R. 9766).

#### SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

(2 p. m.)

For the relief of J. F. McMurray (H. R. 10741).

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

696. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of material to the sea scout department of the Boy Scouts of America; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

697. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of St. Johns River, Fla., from Jacksonville to the ocean (H. Doc. No. 483); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

698. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, for the fiscal year 1930, amounting to \$300,000 (H. Doc. No. 484); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

699. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment, Library of Congress, for the fiscal year 1924, in the sum of \$33.23 (H. Doc. No. 485); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

700. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report on work done, expenditures and receipts, expenses under Federal highway act; roads and trails in the national forest; receipts and expenditures, Center Market, District of Columbia, and disposition of useless papers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

701. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment, United States Botanic Garden, for the fiscal year 1929, in the sum of \$15,000 (H. Doc. No. 486); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

702. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations pertaining to the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, for the fiscal year 1929, in the sum of \$42,348 (H. Doc. No. 487); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

703. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report that the field office of the Steamboat Inspection Service at Honolulu, Hawaii, has reported the sale of 210 pounds of useless papers and the revenue received from the sale was 47 cents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

704. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of the withdrawals and restorations contemplated by the statutes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

705. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of expenditures from the appropriation "Support and civilization of Indians, 1928"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SHREVE: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 15569. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.



Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 261. A resolution amending clause 4 of Rule XI of the rules of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1962). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 272. A resolution to create a standing committee on memorials; without amendment (Rept. No. 1963). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 273. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 9200, H. R. 14659, S. 1976, and S. 1275, bills providing for the appointment of additional judges; without amendment (Rept. No. 1964). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1965. An act to authorize the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of Mississippi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. J. Res. 357. A joint resolution entitling all employees of the United States Government in the District of Columbia to pay for Monday, December 24, 1928, the same as any other holiday; without amendment (Rept. No. 1966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 15568) to provide for the acquisition, sale, and closer settlement of delinquent lands on irrigation projects by the Government to protect its investment; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 15569) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 15570) authorizing S. R. Cox, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near New Martinsville, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15571) to repeal the act for the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near New Martinsville, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 15572) to amend the radio act of 1927; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 15573) to amend the World War veterans act, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 15574) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 15575) to amend the Federal water power act and to more clearly define and declare Federal and State water power policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 15576) to authorize credit upon charges due the United States by the farmers' irrigation district, North Platte irrigation project, Nebraska and Wyoming; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 15577) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of material to the sea-scout department of the Boy Scouts of America; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 15578) proposing a location at Flathead Lake, Mont., for a summer residence for the President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 15579) providing for the construction of a sanatorium and hospital at Ogden, Utah, and providing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BERGER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 361) authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim a full pardon and amnesty to certain political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAIL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 362) for the appointment of one member of the Board of Managers of the

National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 363) authorizing the granting of permits to the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President elect in March, 1929, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 15580) granting a pension to Isalah Nixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15581) granting a pension to Samatha A. Broszt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15582) granting a pension to Walter Fallen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15583) for the relief of Raymond H. Leu; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 15584) granting a pension to T. Abraham Hetrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 15585) granting a pension to Helga Ida Maria Gouraud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 15586) granting a pension to Ada Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 15587) granting a pension to Adelia Benson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15588) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Dicus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15589) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 15590) for the relief of Henry I. Power; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15591) for the relief of Claud J. Adams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 15592) granting a pension to Mary Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 15593) granting a pension to Barbra Eakins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15594) granting a pension to Melissa J. Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15595) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15596) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Kittrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15597) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15598) granting an increase of pension to Julia Tremain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15599) granting an increase of pension to Dessie M. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 15600) granting an increase of pension to Lena Jenkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15601) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Nugent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 15602) granting a pension to Elizabeth Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15603) granting a pension to Annie Cruse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEECH: A bill (H. R. 15604) granting an increase of pension to Albert C. Kinsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15605) granting a pension to Lawson T. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 15606) granting an increase of pension to Surilda J. Slavens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 15607) granting a pension to John W. Skaggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 15608) providing for the advancement of Robert G. Dickson on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 15609) granting a pension to Melissa M. McCool; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15610) granting a pension to Grace Hixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15611) granting a pension to Wilbur L. Hensley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15612) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Ellington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSTON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 15613) granting an increase of pension to Woodard Hensley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 15614) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Eva Broderick for the hire of an automobile by agents of the Indian Service; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 15615) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Blosser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 15616) granting six months' pay to H. M. Cawley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15617) to compensate H. M. Cawley for the loss and death of his son, Edward S. Cawley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 15618) for the relief of Thomas H. Dowd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 15619) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Glandon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 15620) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Alvira Coonen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8065. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of Democratic Luncheon Club, of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring and commending the Colorado River project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8066. By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of citizens of Oneida County, N. Y., favoring enactment into law of House bill 11410; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8067. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, protesting against the appropriation of any funds from what is known as "Red River money" for the purpose of constructing a hospital, or for the maintenance of the Kiowa Indian Agency's operating expenses; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

8068. By Mr. McCORMACK: Petition of Cumann Bhreandain, St. Brendan Society, Mary C. O'Connor, 10 Marlboro Street, Belmont, Mass., secretary, urging repeal of the so-called national origins in the immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8069. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Illinois Valley Protective Association, Peoria, Ill., favoring the passage of the Smoot bill (S. 4689 and H. R. 14116), to provide for Federal loans for reclamation purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8070. Also, petition of Ed. S. Vail Butterine Co., Chicago, Ill., opposing the passage of the Haugen bill (H. R. 10958) to amend the definition of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8071. Also, petition of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, favoring amendments to the laws, through which to clothe the courts with power adequately to punish all parties found guilty of the charge of theft and pilferage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8072. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Pennsylvania Society, Sons of the American Revolution, John L. Walker, president, favoring passage of House bill 10171, to exempt from taxation new national headquarters of National Society Sons of the American Revolution; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8073. Also, petition of Pennsylvania Society Sons of the American Revolution, opposing repeal of national origins clause of present immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8074. Also, papers to accompany the following bills: H. R. 15513, granting a pension to Susan Enos; H. R. 15514, granting a pension to Emma H. Woolsey; H. R. 15515, granting a pension to Victoria Davis; and H. R. 15516, granting a pension to Lillie M. Humphreys; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### SENATE

THURSDAY, December 20, 1928

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Strong Son of God, Immortal Love, to whom all the ministries of life are sacraments of beauty, we thank Thee for the gladness of the morning which calls to holy dedication and the

gentle peace of evening which speaks of quiet rest. Help us to a deeper knowledge of the world within, the glorious kingdom of the mind, the deep recesses of the soul, where we can hear Thy voice, comforting our sadness, banishing our care, urging us beyond ourselves to battle for the right. Free us from all pride and fear, from vulgar ambition and ignoble self-indulgence, that our desires may meet and answer to Thine own. Make us brave enough to bear the truth, strong enough to live in the light, and glad to yield ourselves to Thee, our Savior and our Friend. Amen.

#### RELIEF OF FARMERS IN FLOOD-STRICKEN AREAS

The VICE PRESIDENT. According to the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 182) for the relief of farmers in the storm and flood stricken areas of southeastern United States. The joint resolution is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 12, to strike out the word "section" and insert the word "resolution."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, nothing has been done with the Journal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is in order before the reading of the Journal.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, that can not be the case. Nothing can be done before the Journal is disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the unanimous-consent agreement sets aside all rules of the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not care to discuss the matter with the Vice President, but Rule III specifically provides that—

The Presiding Officer having taken the chair, and a quorum being present, the Journal of the preceding day shall be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unanimous-consent agreement provides that the joint resolution shall be the first order of business this morning. Without objection, the reading of the Journal will be dispensed with and the Journal will be approved.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, let the joint resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 182) reported yesterday from the Committee on Agriculture with an amendment, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, for the crop of 1929, to make advances or loans to farmers in the storm and flood stricken areas of the southeastern United States where he shall find that an emergency for such assistance exists for the purchase of seed of cotton, corn, legumes, and vegetable crops, feed for work stock, and fertilizer, and, when necessary, to procure such seed, feed, and fertilizers and sell the same to such farmers. Such advances, loans, or sales shall be made upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe, including an agreement by each farmer to use the seed and fertilizer thus obtained by him for crop production. A first lien on the crop to be produced from seed and fertilizer obtained through a loan, advance, or sale made under this section shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed sufficient security therefor. The total amount of such advances, loans, or sales to any one farmer shall not exceed the sum of \$3,000. All such advances or loans shall be made through such agencies as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate. For carrying out the purposes of this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$15,000,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment of the committee was to strike out, on page 2, line 12, the word "section" and insert the word "resolution," so as to make the sentence read:

For carrying out the purposes of this resolution there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$15,000,000, to be immediately available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the Senate is familiar with what occurred when the Porto Rican relief measure was here on both occasions; first, when it was introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], and again when it was called up for consideration and finally passed. I endeavored on both occasions to make my position clear. The agreement that was reached was that the matter now covered by the pending joint resolution should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This was done.

Yesterday morning we had a meeting of that committee. Representatives of the districts, including all the States that were so seriously damaged, were present. They confirmed what I had already outlined before the Senate. The condition that